FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 223 19 November 1986

USSR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Karpov Briefs Press on Geneva Arms Talks AA 1
Further Report AA 3
Gerasimov Assesses CDU-CSU AA 4
U.S. Deployment of 131st B-52 'Violated' SALT II [Fedyashin] AA 5
Speakes Confirms Deployment AA 5
Matyash Hits U.S. 3d Generation Nuclear Weapons AA 6
Joint U.S. Talks Held on Chemical Weapons Ban AA 7
Bessmertnykh Discusses Post-Reykjavik Situation [Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP 12 Nov] AA 7
Beglov Views European Stands AA 12

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

Kapitsa, Kovalenko Open Asia-Pacific Forum BB 1
TASS Notes Opening of CEMA Institute Session BB 1
CEMA Nuclear Commission Meets in Moscow BB 1
CEMA Light Industry Commission Meets in Minsk BB 2
Academician Bogomolov Views CEMA Meetings BB 2

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Moscow TV Roundtable on Regional Conflicts CC 1
PRAVDA Reviews CEMA Meetings, U.S. Activities [Kotov, 16 Nov] CC 12
World TU Congress Sends Message to Gorbachev [PRAVDA 2 Nov] CC 16

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Controversy Continues Over U.S.-Iran Arms Sales A 1
Reagan Denies Shultz To Resign A 1
NPR Disagreement Cited A 1
Turkatenko Commentary A 1
Ovchinnikov Attacks Weinberger Summit Strategy [PRAVDA 18 Nov] A 2
Canada Resumes Scientific, Cultural Contacts A 3

NORTHEAST ASIA

Further Reportage on Bilateral Talks With Japan C 1
Gerasimov Briefs Press C 1
KYODO on Gorbachev Visit C 1
Institute Director Addresses Asia-Pacific Forum C 2
Moscow Rally Backs Pyongyang Youth Festival Bid C 2

Paper Claims Seoul Ignores DPRK Overtures C 3
[Golts in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Nov]
Comparison on Shevardnadze-Yanai Talks [IZVESTIYA 16 Nov] C 3

SOUTH ASIA

NEW TIMES Interviews DRA Leader Najibullah [Mironov, 10 Nov] D 1
DRA Medics Claim 'Bandits' Use Chemical Weapons D 5

EASTERN EUROPE

Shevardnadze, Bulgarian Envoy Hold 'Warm' Talk F 1
Briefs: Bulgarian Production Association F 1

WESTERN EUROPE

TASS Criticizes Remarks by Norwegian Commander [Chernyshev] G 1

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Islamic Conference Secretary General Received H 1
Talks With Kapitsa 15 Nov H 1
Shevardnadze-Pirzada Talks [IZVESTIYA 16 Nov] H 1
Pirzada Departs Moscow 16 Nov H 2
Gen Ivanovskiy Returns From Syria 15 Nov H 2
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Nov]
Moldavian Official, Delegation Received in Iraq H 2

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

PRAVDA Carries Anniversary Message to Angola [11 Nov] J 1

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

Further Reportage on Supreme Soviet Session R 1
IZVESTIYA on 17 Nov Session R 1
[18 Nov]
Soviet of Union Session R 3
Deputies Discuss Socioeconomics R 3
Budget Debate Continues R 3
Budget Debate Ends R 4
Results To Be Summarized R 4
Session Hears Criticism R 5
TASS Reports Culture Speeches R 5
TV Lists Speakers R 6
Leadership at Evening Session R 6
Third Day Agenda R 7
Soviets Hold Joint Session R 7
Gorbachev, Sokolov Attend R 8
Budget Plan Approved R 8

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Economic Management Commission Holds Session S 1
[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA 16 Oct]
Voronin Addresses Economic Seminar for Ministers S 2
[IZVESTIYA 12 Nov]

AGRICULTURAL AFFAIRS

Nikonov, Others Mark Agricultural Workers Day T 1
Minister Promises Improved Bread Products [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Nov] T 1
Syr-Darya Oblast Exceeds Agricultural Targets T 1
[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 11 Nov]

KARPOV BRIEFS PRESS ON GENEVA ARMS TALKS

LD182248 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2000 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Special program on press conference given by V.P. Karpov, head of the Soviet delegation at the Geneva talks on nuclear and space weapons, chief of the Arms Limitation and Disarmament Problems Administration of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, held 18 November at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow, moderated by Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov; video shows Karpov and Gerasimov seated at Rostrum -- recorded]

[Text] [Karpov] The sixth round of the talks can be described as falling into two stages -- before Reykjavik and after Reykjavik. On the second stage, which we see as the most essential one, the main and most typical thing was the retreat of the U.S. side from all positive developments achieved in Reykjavik.

As a matter of fact, the U.S. side has resorted to a very simple, and I would say unbecoming device. It has preserved its old proposals, added to them those concessions that were made in Reykjavik by the Soviet side, and presented them as new proposals. It appeared that this odd mixture proved to be worse than the position that the United States in fact had when they came to the talks at the start of the sixth round in September of last year. This typical detail, I believe, is not always perceived by the observers who write about the sixth round of the talks. But that is very typical.

To substantiate this I shall cite an example. In Reykjavik, the United States undertook an obligation not to abandon the ABM treaty for 10 years. Mutual understanding was reached on this account. Following that, the U.S. delegation offers another version in their proposals: that the United States can only take a limited obligation not to abandon the ABM treaty for 10 years, but provided that they are granted the possibility to deply the Strategic Defense Initiative. That is, in fact, they reserve the right for themselves to walk out of the ABM treaty during those 10 years under any pretext, while formally taking such obligation.

As for the question of laying down restrictions between actions which are permitted and those which are forebidden, which was also discussed in Reykjavik, and on which Foreign Minister Shevardnadze make specific and precise proposals at his press conference, the U.S. side is altogether avoiding this question assiduously, for instance, in respect to offensive weapons. What is essentially involved is that the second stage is just the stage of elimination of ballistic missiles. Everything relating to the agreement reached in Reykjavik -- and I can testify to that as a witness -- in respect to the possibility of eliminating during the course of the second stage, the second 5-year period, not only ballistic missiles, but also other strategic offensive weapons, and if circumstances permit, all nuclear weapons of the United States and the Soviet Union -- this accord is being denied altogether.

Let us take a third example, an example relating to medium-range missiles in Europe. There was discussion of the Soviet Union making concessions and agreeing not in include the British and French nuclear weapons. We agreed to such concessions. But we agreed to these concessions precisely within the framework of a general complex of the understandings reached in Reykjavik.

Now they tell us that the issue of medium-range missiles should be resolved separately; and what is more, in such a way that the United States receives the right to deploy its medium-range missiles, totaling 100 warheads, in such a way as to be within reach of the territory of the Soviet Union. Whereas we propose, and we state, that no medium-range missiles located in Asia can reach the territory of the United States; and that the United States should deploy in the same manner those 100 warheads that they insist upon.

So, in essence, the United States is even moving toward rejecting our proposal that the Soviet medium-range missiles should not reach the territory of the United States, but this is only so they can deploy their medium-range missiles in such a way that they could reach the territory of the Soviet Union. So, there you have three such examples from three areas.

On 7 November the Soviet Union submitted detailed proposals that express both the spirit and the letter of Reykjavik. These proposals cover the whole gamut of issues that were discussed in Reykjavik, on which accord was reached and on which directions have been indicated that might be used to bring the sides' positions closer together. These proposals, as I have already said, virtually cover everything on which an accord could be achieved. So, we submitted them on the 7th and within a few days the talks on this round concluded.

The U.S. side virtually did not wish to discuss in a serious way the all-embracing, complex proposals of the Soviet Union that had been submitted. We proposed that the next round of the talks should begin in December. We came up against resistance from the U.S. delegation, and it was only after long and stubborn persuasion that the United States agreed to hold a short meeting of representatives of the two delegations at the beginning of December to continue discussions.

We are hoping that at this meeting the United States will get down to discussing the Soviet proposals and give a clear-cut response to them without waiting for the next official round to open, that is, on 15 January. Well, it is possible to hope for a positive response, of course; we'll wait and see. That is what I would like to say about this round.

The second question I would like to discuss is the question regarding the Budapest proposals on conventional armaments and on a reduction in troops and armaments in Europe.

This question in the West now, in NATO circles and particularly in European circles, is being put more and more to the forefront as a kind of brake to solve the issue regarding nuclear weapons in Europe.

A special working group has been set up by NATO which is examining the Budapest proposals, but as yet there has been no response. They keep telling us that this group has still not completed its work, and it will still be working on it until December.

I have to tell you that, according to the decision of the Warsaw Pact, a working group has also been set up within its framework which is also dealing with the Budapest proposals, and that is an examination of questions on how best to implement them in the most practical way.

Today, a session of this working group is being held in Sofia, There will, no doubt, be an announcement about it tomorrow, and about the results of its work.

But I would like to say one main thing, and that is, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has already said, we are in favor of contacts between NATO and the Warsaw Pact with the purpose of discussing questions of the limitation and reduction of conventional weapons. So, we are hoping that now, when the working group of the Warsaw Pact comes out with an appeal to the NATO contries, the NATO countries will ultimately respond in a positive manner to this appeal, and the contacts between the two blocs with the objective of solving questions on the limitation and reduction of conventional armaments can acquire real substance.

[Gerasimov] Question, please.

[FRG Radio Correspondent in Russian] With what objective is the Soviet Union now continuing the talks in Geneva, knowing that the White House is not agreeable to signing a treaty on a package of all your proposals?

[Karpov] But we are not giving up hope that as a result of the talks the U.S. side will look more attentively at those arguments that have been put forward by the Soviet side, that common sense will finally win the day in the U.S. Administration, and that sensible and real agreements in the field of nuclear armaments will be achieved. The necessity for such agreements is dictated by objective reality. That is why there is no getting away from solving them; one way or another they must be solved.

[ASSOCIATED PRESS correspondent in English with superimposed Russian translation] Tell us, please, will the forthcoming working meeting in December be devoted to one single issue, or, as is being reported from Washington, will attention there be focused mainly on space weapons?

[Karpov] I don't know where they get such information in Washington. [chuckles] We left it with the U.S. delegation that what was left uncompleted during the course of the sixth round would continue to be discussed. We, for our part, are expecting from the U.S. delegation a response -- preferably a positive one -- to our proposals that were submitted on 7 November. These proposals cover all three directions of the talks.

[Studio announcer] Comrade Karpov also replied to other journalists' questions.

Further Report

LD182316 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpts] Will nuclear and conventional arms get a reduction? What is to become of the Soviet nuclear moratorium when it expires next January? Why does Mikhail Gorbachev expect [as heard] to visit India? These and other questions were answered at a briefing for newsmen that was held at the press center of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Tuesday. The briefing was held by Gennadiy Gerasimov, in charge of the information department of the Foreign Ministry, and Viktor Karpov, who leads the Soviet delegation to the Geneva talks with the United States on nuclear and space arms. [passage omitted]

Viktor Karpov noted that more people in the West were claiming that reductions in conventional arms and arms forces in Europe were a brake of sorts for a cut in nuclear arms on the continent.

Meanwhile NATO has been giving no reply to the proposals advanced by the Warsaw Treaty nations to bring about a reduction of this kind from the Atlantic to the Ural Mountains. NATO has formed a special working group to tackle this issue, but the West has been rejecting talks so far. The working group that has been set up in the framework of the Warsaw Treaty Organization is ready to enter into contacts with NATO representatives. We hope, said Viktor Karpov, that these contacts will get underway eventually.

Asked what would happen after 1st January, when the Soviet nuclear moratorium expires, he said this must be decided at the end of the year with due account for all the circumstances. He said there is a limit to the Soviet Union's patience. We can't observe the moratorium indefinitely, said the Soviet Foreign Ministry representative. One day we'll have to take a decision and this depends on whether an agreement will be reached to stop the tests. Viktor Karpov said the Soviet Union was ready for immediate and full-scale talks with the United States on this problem and it was ready to solve it, no matter what variant it may take. The objective, he added, is to stop nuclear testing of any kind.

At a briefing at the Soviet Foreign Ministry press center, asked why Mikhail Gorbachev aimed to visit India, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov said the following:

[Begin Gerasimov recording in Russian with superimposed English translation] For years the Soviet Union and India have been friends. In the last few years Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi has visited the Soviet Union three times. The aim of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit is to further friendship and cooperation with India. [end recording]

Gerasimov Assesses CDU-CSU

LD181447 Moscow TASS in English 1435 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS -- The foreign-policy part of the recently published election platform of the Federal Republic of Germany's governing parties -- the Christian Democratic Union (CDU) and the Christian Social Union (CSU) -- includes a number of planks which are incompatible with the interests of security and peaceful cooperation in Europe, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry's Information Department, said here today.

He was speaking in the ministry's press center at a briefing for Soviet and foreign newsmen.

"This program," Gerasimov said, "contains a thesis on a temporary nature of the borders, which contradicts the commitment, made by the FRG under the Moscow Treaty of 1970, to see the borders of all states in Europe as inviolable both now and in the future."

"The foreign-policy section of the platform does not show a realistic approach either to European affairs or the pressing problems of strengthening peace or to disarmament," the Foreign Ministry spokesman said.

"In words, the two parties stand for cuts in nuclear arms, while in fact, they support SDI, repeating claims about its allegedly defensive and non-nuclear nature," he said.

"It is even being asserted," Gerasimov added, "that those renouncing this missile defense system are helping the Soviet Union along to world ascendancy."

The Soviet spokesman also said that the CDU-CSU program reeked of unfriendliness towards the Soviet Union, the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries and that it could only contribute to adding still more obstacles to developing constructive and stable relations between West Germany and these countries.

U.S. DEPLOYMENT OF 131ST B-52 'VIOLATED' SALT II

LD181956 Moscow TASS in English 1944 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 18 TASS -- The TASS correspondent Andrey Fedyashin reports:

The Reagan administration, having firmly taken the road of abandoning the most important treaty obligations in the sphere of nuclear arms control, has already violated the basic provisions of the Soviet-U.S. SALT-2 treaty.

Washington has been accused of this by deputy director of the influential public organization, Arms Control Association, James Rubin. He said in Washington today that the 131st B-52 strategic bomber equipped with cruise missiles with nuclear warheads left the hangers of the auxiliary air base in San Antonio, Texas, and that this shows that the USA has already gone beyond the limits of the SALT-2 treaty.

The bomber was re-equipped as a nuclear missile carrier and deployed at the air base on November 12. The SALT-2 treaty, as is known, envisages the limit of 1,320 units for the number of mirved strategic missiles and bombers with cruise missiles.

The newspaper WASHINGTON POST writes today that a number of high representatives of the administration who asked that their names should not be given also hold that the treaty has already been abandoned since a modified bomber cannot be registered by Soviet technical means of monitoring. The newspaper notes that under the provisions of the treaty, missiles and bombers with cruise missiles must be registered after they leave shops, plants or other facilities.

Speakes Confirms Deployment

LD182123 Moscow TASS in English 2103 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 18 TASS -- The Reagan administration has firmly embarked on the road of torpedoing the crucial treaty commitments in the field of nuclear arms control and does not intend further to adhere to the critical provisions of the Soviet-U.S. SALT-2 treaty.

Larry Speakes, White House deputy press secretary, told a briefing here today that since the SALT-2 treaty was not ratified, it did not exist. He recalled the U.S. President's statement to the effect that the United States would not any longer observe those agreements.

Speakes confirmed that the 131st B-52 bomber equipped with cruise-missiles would be fielded late this year.

MATYASH HITS U.S. 3D GENERATION NUCLEAR WEAPONS

LD181725 Moscow TASS in English 1708 GMT 18 Nov 86

["Soviet Moratorium -- Time of Decisions" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Vladimir Matyash writes:

The Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Reykjavik has highlighted still more forcefully that the problem of freezing nuclear explosions and reaching an accord on a total ban on nuclear tests became one of those watersheds through which the border between the old and new mentality runs.

The Soviet Union's drive to stop all nuclear blasts draw tremendous response all over the world. The move wins more and more supporters each time the Soviet Union extends its unilateral moratorium.

A year and five months without tests is already a political and military reality. It is the manifestation in practice of new thinking in international affairs.

The socialist countries, the conference of the Non-aligned Movement in Harare, representing over 100 states, the leaders of the "Delhi Six", numerous public organizations and trade unions, authoritative political parties in the West, including the West German Social-Democrats and the British Labourites, and prominent scientists across the world supported the Soviet moratorium and urged the United States to follow the USSR's example. Broad sections of the U.S. public and the considerable part of Congress back up the idea of terminating nuclear tests.

Meanwhile, the land in the Nevada desert continues to be shaked with convulsions. Contrary to common sense and the imperative of the time, the United States has already conducted the 23rd nuclear weapon test there since the movement when the Soviet moratorium was announced. Resistance to a halt to the nuclear arms race on the part of the current U.S. Administration and the powerful military-industrial complex is stout.

The Soviet Union scrupulously complies with the moratorium. Silence reigns at the Soviet test sites. But at this very time the United States goes ahead with nuclear explosions, perfects new types of nuclear armaments. The point at issue is, first and foremost, the development of space strike weapons for offensive, aggressive purposes. There are plans to put third-generation nuclear weapons designed to strike targets in space and to hit ground, maritime and air targets.

It is precisely third-generation nuclear weapons that call the attention of the Pentagon which views them among the crucial ones in the set of space strike weapons to be used in "Star Wars".

On the banks of the Potomac they do not conceal that American specialists currently regard lasers powered by a nuclear explosion and nuclear weapons with an enhanced electromagnetic impulse as the most promising types of such weapons. They are given priority in plans to develop the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative".

The moment of truth has come now, the truth that the Soviet moratorium is the unique historic chance for all states to do away with the nuclear arms race. History will not pardon those who will fail to make use of this chance.

JOINT U.S. TALKS HELD ON CHEMICAL WEAPONS BAN

LD190400 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0321 GMT 19 Nov 86

["Soviet-U.S. Talks on Chemical Weapons Held" -- TASS headline]

[Text] New York, 19 Nov (TASS) -- The fourth round of Soviet-U.S. talks on all aspects of the problem of concluding an effective and monitorable international convention on the universal and total banning of chemical weapons was held in New York from 28 October to 18 November. The USSR delegation put forward new initiatives at the talks on guarantees of the nonproduction of chemical weapons in the commercial (civilian) industry, and on on-site inspection on request. The USSR delegation at the talks was headed by Ambassador V.L. Israelyan, Collegium member of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and the U.S. delegation by Ambassador D. Lowitz. [title as received]

BESSMERTNYKH DISCUSSES POST-REYKJAVIK SITUATION

AU101341 Budapest MAGYAR HIRLAP (supplement) in Hungarian 12 Nov 86 p 5

[Interview given by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, deputy minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, to MAGYAR HIRLAP staffer Pal Bokor: "After Reykjavik" -- date and place not given]

[Text] [MAGYAR HIRLAP] What is the future of Soviet-American relations? This seems to be the most important question among those of key importance relating to world political affairs after Reykjavik, and after some other events taking place since then. You were the head of one of the Soviet delegations in Reykjavik. Great expectations were attached to the summit and it was only natural on that particular Sunday that journalists -- I am not talking about diplomats -- were somewhat disappointed. Since then, however, we have heard nothing from either side other than there is no need for disappointment, Reykjavik was a success after all.

[Bessmertnykh] Such an analysis can only come from Geneva. There we agreed on three things. First: We will endeavor to improve Soviet-American relations. Second: We will speed up the disarmament talks in Geneva. Third: We will not endeavor to obtain military superiority and will try to exclude the possiblity of a nuclear war.

Following the Geneva summit the months of November and December passed. In January the Soviet Union came up with a comprehensive program of disarmament, giving the Americans a chance to join us on the path of action in the most important sphere of relations. This was followed by our unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests and by the initiative of the socialist countries concerning conventional weapons. This means that for our part, in the spirit of the Geneva agreement, we drew up a broad and concrete program for action, for both the Americans and the whole world to see. We did this in the belief that the continuation of this process would also include a summit meeting.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] Mikhail Gorbachev's Washington visit was almost certain.

[Bessmertnykh] The reaction of the American Administration, however, was unfortunately not to our liking. As you know, the main characteristic of our relations is that for us the central issue of the whole system of relations is composed of security questions, where questions of nuclear and space armament represent the axis. I only mention this to indicate that people could judge the situation of Soviet-American relations by the Geneva issue. While economic, humanitarian, cultural, and other issues may indicate the degree of relations with other countries, these issues are only of peripheral value in Soviet-American relations. We cannot judge the level of relations by the number of ballet performances and exhibitions. For us the most significant index has always been the questions of nuclear and space weapons. If there is progress in this field, then relations are improving and if there is no progress, they are stagnating. Returning to the issue of Geneva, we reached a stalemate. The Americans were performing a ritual dance around their own proposals submitted on 1 November, and we could not take a single step forward. Then, at the beginning of the summer we decided to unlock the process of normalization and create a mechanism -- this was Comrade Gorbachev's idea, and he explained it in his letter to Reagan -- for preparing the foreign ministerial meeting in the fall. This was an almost unprecedented solution, involving the operation of around 10 working groups in the most diverse areas. The most important group, of course, was the one dealing with nuclear and space weapons at the expert level. Both of the groups were working with experts. [sentence as published] The American side agreed to this and, as a result, we have had a rather hot summer. In August and at the beginning of September our experts were busy discussing nuclear weapons, including space weapons, as well as regional and bilateral problems. In this way it was possible to create good practical conditions for a serious and objective discussion between Shevardnadze and Shultz. Yet all these actions were parallel to certain extremely unfavorable American actions, such as the expelling of Soviet diplomats working in New York, the attack on Libya, and the arrest of Zakharov. It was an extremely gross action to expel 25 Soviet citizens from New York just 1 day prior to the foreign ministerial meeting. This means that there were two opposing processes going on at the same time. One for creating some kind of relations, and another for ruining it.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] In any case, nothing much has happened in Geneva where the most important issues should have been discussed.

[Bessmertnykh] This is true. Following the experts' discussions, the Soviet leadership again examined the situation and came to the conclusion that, in spite of an intensive effort, relations are still in a stalemate both in general and in Geneva. This was clear from our discussions with Nitze, Kampelman, and Perle. All three of them came to Moscow, and we held talks in the Foreign Ministry's dacha in Meshcherino near Moscow, and this was followed by our team's visit to Washington. However, nothing much was achieved by these talks. Therefore, Gorbachev wrote a letter to Reagan -- this was on 15 September -- which was then passed on by our foreign minister, Shevardnadze. In this letter, Gorbachev suggested an urgent working meeting in preparation for the Washington visit. In his letter Comrade Gorbachev explained clearly that the situation of the talks is disturbing, and the talks need a strong political push to move forward, and this can only be done through a meeting and a dialogue on the highest level. This is how the idea of Reykjavik was conceived. The Americans chose this town, but we also proposed London. They also accepted the date, but we told them that we would be ready to lay aside all our work to make this meeting.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] Our readers know what the Soviet proposals at the Reykjavik meeting contained, but opinions differ as to their meaning and aims. As a member of a Soviet delegation, what do you see as the unusualness of these proposals?

[Bessmertnykh] They differ above all because we have come up with a completely new idea regarding the curb on strategic arms. [paragraph continues]

The 50-percent reduction mentioned here is different from all the previous 50-percent reductions proposed by either the Soviet Union or the United States. The Soviet side had previously referred to a 50-percent reduction of those strategic nuclear weapons that are able to reach the territory of the other side. In other words, it referred to the so-called forward based systems [eloretolt allasban] and to the medium-range missiles. When the Americans spoke about a 50-percent reduction of strategic arms, they were thinking above all about ballistic missiles. Our present proposal refers to all kinds of weapons included in the triangle of strategic arms: a 50-percent reduction of intercontinental ballistic missiles, a 50-percent reduction of submarine launched ballistic missiles, and a 50-percent reduction of heavy bombers This concept means the following: Nuclear confrontation will be reduced to one-half, while the structure of the historically developed strategic offensive weapons will be maintained completely. This is simple, but this simplicity gives the idea its brilliance, and this is the particular element that most commentators somehow failed to notice. At the Reykjavik talks on medium-range missiles -- this is, of course, a paradox — we insisted on the acceptance of the American proposal.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] That is, on the acceptance of Reagan's zero option.

[Bessmertynykh] Yes, the zero option. The President and the secretary of state became stubborn for a while and insisted on an initial solution that would, of course, assume the retention of a certain number of missiles in Europe. As a result of an intensive dialogue, however, the Americans agreed to a zero option in Europe. In the meantime, we agreed to significantly reduce the Soviet medium-range missiles in Asia. What we wanted was to set off a concrete process of reducing nuclear arms. This aim is noble enough for us to agree to concrete concessions. We also heeded the interests of Western European countries, the whole of Europe, that is, the interests of Western and Eastern Europe, both of which would like to live without weapons. Furthermore, we considered the interests of the Asian countries and, of course, those of the entire socialist camp. This is how we arrived at working out a series of very interesting and, what is more, very realistic formulas concerning the medium-range missiles in Europe. The Americans received the right to fit as many warheads to medium-range missiles here in our area [nalunk], on the continental part [kontinentalis reszen] of the United States, as we do, that is 100 warheads. [sentence as published]

Of course, we also discussed the question of endearing the ABM Treaty, and here we had a clash of two concepts. Afterwards Reagan asked us why we refused the agreement due to one single word. Well, in this case, each single word has a strategic importance.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] Why was it necessary to endorse the ABM Treaty if it has been in force without a deadline since 1972? Yet the Soviet Union has put a sharp accent on this question.

[Bessmertnykh] This is very simple. It was necessary because we agreed to a 50-percent reduction of strategic arms over 5 years and the total elimination of these arms over the following 5 years. Therefore, the Soviet Union as a responsible power cannot accept the making of such vital steps in nuclear disarmament "without securing its hinterland", and without securing all the conditions that would enable us to endeavor to acomplish these deep cuts in a peaceful manner, without mutual distrust, and in an atmosphere of confidence. This is obvious, and it would be strange to accept the reduction of the most significant weapons or even their total elimination, while the other side could acquire new types of weaponry threatening the security of the Soviet Union.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] I think we seldom hear about the SDI, the space defense initiative, being presented to international public opinion as a purely defensive system.

[Bessmertnykh] As long as there are nuclear arms, the space defense initiative creates a danger for us, despite all its defensive nature. Looking at SDI in the presence of strategic nuclear arms, which incidentally are at present being modernized in the United States, it is dangerous precisely bacause of its defensive nature, since it provides a first-strike capacity to its possessor. The side hiding behind such a system is trying to exclude the possiblity of a counterattack. If we assume circumstances without strategic nuclear weapons, SDI would still continue to be a danger because there are offensive elements in the system itself. If somebody is trying to use a new physical phenomena in destroying nuclear warheads in outer space, he could obviously also use the very same systems under atmospheric and terrestrial conditions. This is all the more true, because the Americans themselves are talking a lot about developing systems to destroy missiles in their climbing phase. These systems, therefore, have their own offensive potential and not even the American side denies this. In this respect a question has arisen, which was put to Ronald Reagan by Mikhail Gorbachev: All right, you say that SDI is aimed against ballistic missiles and indeed, this is the concept of the program. Nevertheless, if we have now agreed on eliminating all ballistic missiles without exception, along with the rest of the strategic triangle, thus approaching the practical elimination of all nuclear arms, then what is SDI for?

The Reagans' advisors have prepared two versions of the answer. One of them says: What happens if one side wanted to cheat the other? This answer is unacceptable, because we are the side promoting the stricter verification measures. We are prepared to jointly work out a system of verification that would make the above-mentioned assumption impossible, that is, one side cheating the other.

The other answer by Reagan was that, despite a realiable system of verification, a madman could acquire an atomic bomb, and in such a case the United States could only protect itself with the SDI. This sounds like a joke, but we have indeed heard this argument, and it was repeated several times in Reykjavik alone. In our answer we explained precisely and clearly that our 15 January proposals included the concept of creating a global system of verification and guarantees which would prevent nuclear terrorism. Thus, it is beyond doubt that this question can be solved.

It is probably, therefore, that this was not the case at issue. Our analysis is unambiguous. We have reviewed all possible variations and reached a definite conclusion. There is a fresh attempt to gain superiority over the Soviet Union and the socialist community. We have, however, told the American partners that this will lead nowhere, they should not waste their money.

As for the ABM treaty, we requested that none of the parties would use its right to discontinue the observance of the treaty. Thus, the treaty would remain as it was, without a deadline. Of course, the participating parties would not be able to carry out tests on elements of antimissile weaponry in space. This is namely prohibited by the agreement. So this was our condition, and we even emphasized that research and testing may continue under laboratory conditions.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] A few days ago, THE NEW YORK TIMES carried a report according to the Soviet side, at the next meeting between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Secretary of State George Shultz in Vienna, could perhaps even declare tests on SDI outside the laboratory to be acceptable.

[Bessmertnykh] In our view it is possible to carry out tests in the area of antimissile defense by way of land-based, stationary systems. This is permitted by the treaty. However, it categorically forbids testing in outer space. The Americans have insisted on allowing the parties to develop a space defense system after the 10 years have expired. But first, this again could only be possible by completely upsetting the ABM Treaty. [paragraph continues]

Second, it would also assume that not only the United States but even the Soviet Union has been preparing to set up a space defense system. However, if the Americans do opt for setting up this system, we will be choosing another way. We have our own calculations, which are not the same as those of the American plans in an engineering, technological sense. It will be a worthy and suitable answer.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] Let us now return to the prospects for Soviet-American relations after Reykjavik.

[Bessmertnykh] We are willing to wait. We are willing to wait for the American Administration to carefully examine the results of the Reykjavik talks and decide upon the path it intends to go in the future; or put more simply, until it has solved the question of whether the American Administration is able to extract itself from the net of the military-industrial complex. It was clearly evident in Reykjavik that such a net exists. The President was not able to make decisions on his own. One could feel that he did not have enough power. We must wait and see what the future brings. We on our side are still willing to adhere to the agreements which were reached in Reykjavik. We are ready to follow the path of nuclear disarmament and peace in space, and at the same time to participate in solving other problems, the questions of chemical weapons, and of conventional arms. In other words, the question is: Are the Americans capable of changing their approach to today's problems according to the demands of the end of the 20th century? If they are, all roads toward settling our relations are free.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] You have mentioned that Reagan was not, in fact, free to make decisions. On the other hand, there are also more moderate forces in American political affairs. For instance, just a few days ago former President Carter strongly criticized the policy of his successor, referring precisely to the space defense initiative. Here is the question: Based on purely diplomatic assumptions, would it not be more favorable, more reliable, to simply "play a waiting game" until the political conditions of power in the United States have changed?

[Bessmertnykh] As to your question, the answer is negative. In general, our tactical approach is that we do not adjust our foreign policy and diplomatic considerations to actual American domestic struggles at a particular moment. This would bear no results, and for us the golden rule is to work with a government that is elected by the American people. Therefore, we do not intend to freeze the movement toward agreements, we do not intend to put the already emerging trends on ice. This would only cause a great loss of time. In addition, we do not believe that the present American Government has exhausted all its resources in terms of common sense and rationality; and it is possible that if it calmly evaluates all circumstances, it will still find it possible to give a favorable answer. Thus, we are willing to work with this government, and will be working with it.

[MAGYAR HIRLAP] In this respect, could we say that the preparations for Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Washington are still going on?

[Bessmertnykh] The greatest step in preparing the Washington trip was made in Reykjavik. We will see how things turn out. The most important thing is that the question of the Washington visit by the general secretary of the CPSU is still on the agenda. Preparations are continuing for this important event. At the same time, what we can expect from this visit is well-known, since this is why we met in Reykjavik. It is inadmissable that, following the meetings in Geneva and Reykjavik, the official visit of the CPSU general secretary to the United States should end with no results. Preparations must be made and guarantees must be given that the hopes of the people we have been talking about will come true, that the world can breathe easier, and that we will finally reach some agreements. [paragraph continues]

Well, the prepartory work will continue, but this work must go on on both sides; and it is very important for the American Administration to also actively participate in preparing Comrade Gorbachev's Washington visit.

Beglov Views European Stands

LD172223 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 17 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The lessons of Reykjavik and European security is the subject of the commentary by Spartak Beglov, APN political observer:

[Beglov] Hello, comrades! The recent trip by Margaret Thatcher, head of the British Government, across the ocean and her talks with President Reagan in Camp David took place at a time when the whole world is assimilating the lessons of Reykjavik. As far as Western Europe is concerned, the stance of the governments, especially of the NATO member states, is not identical. Some ponder the possibilities of coming closer to the prospect of a non-nuclear world, others -- strange as it might seem -- are concerned with ways of helping Washington to move even futher away from the boundaries approached in Reykjavik.

The echo of the debates recently held in the Bonn Bundestag on the results of the post-Reykjavik visit to Washington by another West European leader, FRG Chancellor Kohl, is still resounding. Kohl was made to face a serious, and an evidently just reproach. That is, Kohl, instead of encouraging the U.S. Administration to consolidate and develop what was achieved in Reykjavik, sought new arguments against total elimination of nuclear armaments, along with yet again expressing his solidarity with the SDI program. Judging from all, the same mood prevailed during Mrs Thatcher's conversations in Camp David.

In some NATO capitals, they are trying to pretend that nothing happened, as if the USSR had made not steps toward the United States and its partners on the issues of nuclear weapons, as if the proposals of the socialist countries on considerable, well-balanced cuts in armaments and conventional forces over the entire space from the Atlantic to the Urals do not exist for them. Is that a shortage of new thinking? Unfortunately, yes.

In the meantime, the Soviet proposals in Reykjavik are an example of a truly constructive and all-embracing approach to the issues of disarmament. The starting point of this approach is that it is no longer possible to rely on weapons, especially nuclear weapons, as a means of preserving peace and security. It was precisely Reykjavik that showed a turning-point toward a non-nuclear world and a non-nuclear Europe. The double game in the spirit of reviewing the outcome of Reykjavik and promotion of the SDI program are only capable of tightening the nuclear-space noose even more around the issues of disarmament. It is only possible to undo it through embarking on the path of mutually acceptable agreements in accordance with the Reykjavik package. That is in the interests of security of one and all.

KAPITSA, KOVALENKO OPEN ASIA-PACIFIC FORUM

LD181037 Moscow TASS in English 1006 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS -- An international scientific conference on the subject "International Relations and Topical Issues of Ensuring Peace and Security in the Far East" has opened at the Institute of the Far East of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR today. The conference is being attended by scientists and members of research centres in Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Czechoslovakia and representatives of a number of Soviet research institutions.

The conference opened with addresses of greetings by professor Ivan Kovalenko, deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, and Mikhail Kapitsa, USSR deputy foreign minister.

The three-day forum will cover problems pertaining to ensuring cooperation in Asia and the Pacific. The point at issue will be Soviet proposals set forth in the documents of the 27th Congress of the CPSU and the speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in Vladivostok. Scientists will exchange views on problems caused by the buildup of the militaristic efforts of the USA, Japan and South Korea, on questions pertaining to outlining ways and methods of ensuring security in the Asian-Pacific region, economic cooperation and economic security.

TASS NOTES OPENING OF CEMA INSTITUTE SESSION

LD181517 Moscow TASS in English 1440 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS -- The 34th session of the Academic Council of the CEMA Institute of Economic Problems of the World Socialist System opened in Moscow today. it will specify the spheres of the institute's work in 1986-1990. Delegations of scientists will take part in the scientific conference "New Tasks and Problems of the Development of Economic Cooperation of the CMEA Member Countries in the Setting of Decisions of the Fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties".

CEMA NUCLEAR COMMISSION MEETS IN MOSCOW

LD181251 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1140 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 18 Nov (TASS) -- Issues relating to interaction in speeding up the development of nuclear power engineering are being discussed at the 51st session of the CEMA Standing Commission on Cooperation in the Sphere of the Use of Nuclear Power For Peaceful Purposes which opened here today. The program for the construction of nuclear power stations and heat-supply nuclear stations for up to the year 2000 remains one of the priority directions in the joint work of the scientists from fraternal countries. The delegates will also discuss matters connected with the participation of socialist countries in organizing an international safety procedure for nuclear power engineering.

CEMA LIGHT INDUSTRY COMMISSION MEETS IN MINSK

LD181513 Moscow TASS in English 1447 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Minsk November 18 TASS -- The tasks of accelerating the development of the consumer goods industry are being considered by the 47th meeting of the CEMA Standing Commission for Cooperation in Light Industry, which opened in Minsk, capital of Soviet Belorussia, today. The agenda of the meeting includes the organization of joint projects to develop advanced technology and processes and automated control systems for the industry. The delegates are considering possibilities for extending direct relations with a view to co-production ventures in the consumer goods industry.

ACADEMICIAN BOGOMOLOV VIEWS CEMA MEETINGS

LD182304 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; interview with Academician O.T. Bogomolov, director of the Institute of Economics of the World Socialist System, by unidentified reporter -- live or recorded]

[Text] [Bogomolov] The last 2 weeks of November have been marked with significant events for relations between the CEMA member countries. A meeting of CEMA was held recently in Bucharest, and a meeting of first secretaries and general secretaries of the fraternal parties was held in Moscow. There is nothing extraordinary or unusual in the fact that these conferences were held. The leaders of governments and parties meet regularly in order to discuss relevant issues of development of the new society, to exchange information and opinions, and to take counsel. But it is clear that when the highest-ranking leaders meet around the table, very major, key issues of strategy are involved. And as we know from the concluding report of the meeting in Moscow, fundamental problems of the futher development and improvement of cooperation among the countries of socialism were discussed.

It is clear that the state of affairs in the various countries of socialism differs. But at the same time, they also encounter a number of mutually relevant issues, such as the need to make a fuller use of the potential of socialism for accelerating scientific and technical progress, for raising the productivity of labor, and asserting the socialist way of life. There are a considerable number of difficulties and unresolved issues in these fields as well, and one should take counsel and exchange experience.

As we know from the concluding report, special prominence was attached to the issues of further expanding technical cooperation among the CEMA countries. They were discussed in detail at the CEMA session, but there are also major issues which call for the attention of the party leaders. Significant successes have been reached in this cooperation, but the CEMA participants are concerned over many aspects of its development. In particular, the expansion of trade turnover lacks dynamism, many commodities which are delivered on a reciprocal basis are low quality and do not meet world standards. Specialization of production among these countries, the scientific-technical and production cooperation -- the main line along which the reciprocal exchange of commodities can expand -- has not yet been given enough prominence. In short, there are quite a lot of issues arising in the course of mutual relations of the CEMA countries, which need to be discussed and resolved.

MOSCOW TV ROUNDTABLE ON REGIONAL CONFLICTS

LD182253 Mosow Television Service in Russian 1555 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Roundtable discussion entitled: "Regional Conflicts in a Nuclear Age" presented by political observer Farid Seyful-Mulyukov; with Harold Saunders, former U.S. assistant secretary of state for the Near East and South Asia; Robert Naumann, former U.S. ambassador in Afghanistan, Morocco, and Saudi Arabia; Philip Stewart, U.S. coordinator of the Dartmouth meetings and director of the USSR foreign policy research program at Ohio University; Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, "head" of the World Economics and International Relations Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; Aleksandr Konstantinovich Kislov, deputy director of the World Economics and International Relations Institute; and Viktor Grigoryevich Korgun, senior researcher at the Oriental Studies Institute; in Moscow; date not given; U.S. officials speak in English with superimposed Russian translation; video shows participants seated around table -- recorded]

[Text] [Seyful-Mulyukov] Hello, comrades. Prominent Soviet and U.S. political scientists are taking part in our television program. I will introduce them later. They met in Moscow at the sessions of the regional conflicts working group within the framework of the so-called Dartmouth Conferences. They are called so after the name of the college in the town of Hannover in the U.S. State of New Hampshire and they have been taking place for more than quarter of a century. They meet alternatly in the United States and in the Soviet Union and prominent academics, businessmen, politicians and cultural figures take part in them. It is necessary to stress that within the framework of the Dartmouth conferences the Soviet-U.S. dialogue continued even during periods when talks between our countries at government level were infrequent. The sessions of Dartmouth Conferences and its working groups discuss, within a wider context, aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations, key problems of disarmament, and regional conflicts. And now it is time to introduce the participants in our program. I will start with our U.S. guests.

Harold Saunders, former assistant U.S. secretary of state for the Near East and South Asia. He is one of the authors of the known Camp David accord. I will not forestall our discussion and I think that the role of this accord will be discussed in our conversation. Mr Saunders is currently a member of the board of the U.S. enterprise Institute for Public Political Research. This institute is engaged both in scientific research and in advising the White House, in particular, on the Near East. Harold Saunders plays a prominent role in its work. He is the U.S. cochairman of the regional conflicts working group within the framework of the Dartmouth Conference.

Robert Naumann, former U.S. ambassador in Afghanistan, Morocco and Saudi Arabia. During Ronald Reagan's inauguration Newman -- if my memory does not betray me -- was a member of the presidential group on taking over the State Department affairs. Mr Newman is now the head of the near east programme at the Strategic and Intenational Research Center at the very prestigious Georgetown University.

Philip Stewart, U.S. coordinator of the Dartmouth meetings, director of the USSR Foreign Policy Research Program at Ohio University, professor of political sciences.

I will cut short the introduction of the Soviet participants in the roundtable -- I think they will not be offended because our viewers know them well. Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov has been for many years the USSR cochairman of the regional conflicts working group within the framework of the Dartmouth Conference.

He has been studying the historic and scientific aspects of the present-day Near East problems for a long time. Comrade Primakov is now heading one of the leading humanities institutes of the Academy of Sciences -- the World Economics and International Relations Institute.

Aleksandr Konstantinovich Kislov, deputy director of this institute, doctor of historical sciences, is taking part in our program too; and also Viktor Grigoryevich Korgun, senior researcher at the oriental studies institute.

Military conflicts, hotbeds of war, have been present in various parts of the world for many years. Some reckon that an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations should take place, first of all, through the resolution of conflict situations which destablilize the international situation and U.S.-Soviet relations themselves. There is also another point of view: The main key to improving the entire international situation is the elimination of the threat of a nuclear war and the liquidation of weapons of mass destruction. There is also a third view, the essence of which is that regional conflicts do not, allegedly, particularly influence Soviet-U.S. relations and the entire world situation. I do not know in what way the working group meetings discussed all these problems. There was no relevant reporting in the press. We have invited Soviet and U.S. scientists to take part in a television discussion on these issues. First of all, I would like to give the floor to our U.S. guests; Harold Saunders, I think you will begin our discussion.

[Saunders] Thank you very much for inviting us here. From the very beginning I would like to throw light on the importance of discussing issues such as Afghanistan and the Near East since, in my understanding, we ourselves need to discuss these matters thoroughly, to find out in depth, what, in fact, are the vital interests of each of our countries in a particular region. You understand that we are discussing these issues not only academically, because it is essential to understand how -- in what ways and forms -- the competition between us in real world is conducted and not merely in the scientific world. Thus, for instance, we can go along parallel routes in solving the Arab-Israeli conflict and, through clarifying these routes, we can begin to understand better the stakes, the risks of each side, at every turn of events in this particular region.

Using this information, we will be able to understand and define for ourselves how we can avoid a crisis between us, just as by parallel means we can find a solution to these problems, and possibly even somehow establish cooperation on these problems, albeit working cooperation, with the aim, if not of resolving, then of alleviating conflicts in hotspots of the planet. We therefore view our discussion as a kind of laboratory, so that we might have a deeper understanding of how we can, jointly or in parallel, resolve worldwide problems.

[Primakov] I would like to add a few words to what Harold Saunders has said. First of all I would like to respond to those issues set before us by our master of this round table, Farid Seyful-Mulyukov. I think that it would not be correct to counterpose the issues of disarmament and regional conflicts. The thing is that, in fact, the path to disarmament, the path to arms reduction, including, naturally, profound reductions in the arms race and so on, is a main road on the way to improving the international situation. This is all a main road, because if this road is not going to exist, then there will simply be no humankind. At the same time, conflicts also exist, and both their existence and their development affect stability in the international situation -- they undermine stability, and the conflicts turn into detonators which, in the conditions of the arms race, could burn up the international situation, blow up the world.

It seems to me, therefore, that those who say -- and we have heard these voices in the United States in our time -- that first, they say, comes trust, first, they say, let's come to an agreement on eliminating conflict situations, and after that, they say, let's get down to questions of disarmament, are incorrect. It seems to me that this kind of arrangement is unacceptable. But it does not follow that there should be any belittling of the importance of the work on eliminating conflict situations.

And now a rejoinder, just on what Harold Saunders said. We are indeed interested in not being drawn into certain situations, in avoiding the possiblity of clashing with one another that is one of the aims facing us. But at the same time, I would not restrict myself to the examination of a conflict situation on precisely this aspect. Indeed, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev stressed, as one of the elements in the new political way of thinking, the need that the Soviet Union still has, namely the need not to view conflict situations only through the prism of Soviet-American relations.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] You wanted to add something, please go ahead.

[Stewart] Yes, I do want to add a few words. I thank you for giving me the floor. I think that in evaluating the questions, and when we respond to the questions posed by the moderator on the relationship between disarmament and regional conflicts it would be useful to try to understand the approaches of the American public, and American public opinion, to all these issues. You see, the American attitude to the Soviet Union is based on two fears, or sources of fear. The first is fear of nuclear war -- nuclear catastrophe is indisputably a fear that has taken deep root, and it unites our sides. Moreover, nevertheless, there in another fear -- fear of Soviet might, of Soviet strength, of Soviet expansionism and of their being used for real . In recent years this fear has somewhat lessened, but nevertheless it remains an evident factor on the international scene. Regional conflicts are the most clear-cut manifestations of this fact. In the development of regional conflicts we can see direct evidence, direct and graphic manifestation of Soviet intentions, we define the degree to which is far from denying what Primakov said on the importance of local factors in regional conflicts. I would just like to stress that the role played by both sides in the course of these conflicts to a certain extent forms our overall attitude, our point of view, now this influences the relationship between disarmament and regional conflicts. First of all, I would agree that the real policy of the United States is one that does not counterpose the settlement of regional conflicts, as some kind of force working against disarmament. We have been implementing both these processes in parallel over the course of many years. I would particularly like to note, first of all, that tangible steps that could lead to progress, to a solution of these long-standing crises, are what are now needed. First of all such steps are needed in Afghanistan and the regions adjacent to it. If they take place, it will help to a significant extent diminish fear regarding Soviet intentions throughout the world, and correspondingly strengthen public support for those difficult choices we simply have to make in the world in which we live, and in which nuclear weapons play, if not an even-increasing role, then a constantly prominent one.

Precisely because of this, regional conflicts hold a special place. They are a kind of pointer, an indicator, of the real intentions of each side. And it is in precisely this sense that we are holding our discussions. Here, in precisely this sense, I regard our discussions as encouraging, in the sense that we are beginning to understand with increasing clarity how each side approaches the questions that divide us today.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] You have painted quite an impressive picture of the U.S. public's fear of Soviet might and Soviet exapnsionism. I think Aleksandr Konstantinovich Kislov will reply to this question.

[Kislov] Strictly speaking it isn't even a question, just a point of view. But I would like to dwell on this point of view, and look at it from a slightly different angle. Yes, indeed, conflicts exist. I am convinced of that. The majority of these conflicts have, as it were, deep national, religious, economic, historical, and other roots. But, of course, at the same time, if one looks at things in depth, one cannot deny that behind practically all the regional conflicts in the world today stands the legacy of either the old colonial system, which carved the world up, chopped into two, or into several pieces, nationalities, ethnic groups, and tribes, leaving them on opposite sides of borders, imposed differences between different ethnic groups, countries, and nations by pursuing the old policy of divide-and-rule, which dates back to ancient Rome.

To be absolutely frank, and in my view the point of our meetings and discussions is that we can speak absolutely frankly, trying to get as close as possible to the truth and to a better understanding of each other's positions and views, on the whole I am deeply convinced that the policy of the United States stands behind many of the conflicts in the modern world. However unpleasant it may be for our U.S. colleagues to hear it, I am deeply convinced of this, and I consider it necessary to repeat it.

We talk a lot these days about new thinking. I think that this meeting of ours to some extent already reflects this approach to the need to look in a new way at many factors that would previously have seemed perfectly clear to us. In saying this, I don't mean that the United States and the Soviet Union can resolve all conflicts, or, as it were, resolve at least the question of settling all, or most, of the conflicts. Of course not. We cannot impose our own will upon peoples, and if even if we try to do so, it will mean imposing our will upon somebody, and such a settlement will not be lasting or firm. But undoubtedly, if we act together, we would be able to create conditions more favorable for settling conflicts.

At times we have come very close to understanding what must be done to resolve a particular conflict. But unfortunately no tangible steps have flowed from our understanding.

We can talk a lot about Afghanistan, for instance. You raised the question of what is going on in Afghanistan. The USSR withdraws six regiments, and the U.S. Government announces the delivery of ground-to-air missiles.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Excuse me, I think that Robert Naumann wants to come into the discussion. Please.

[Naumann] Thank you very much. I would simply like to confine myself to a simple statement, that I cannot acccept the picture that has been drawn here, that allegedly the United States is responsible for the majority of these conflicts. As far as time permits, let us get down to the essence of the matter. However, at the moment I do not wish to go into detail, but simply to make the following observation. Conflicts do not arise solely and exclusively from a policy of some kind of intentions and cultivation by the main powers -- the Soviet Union and the United States. They are regional conflicts because they arise from the very core of other, smaller, often subordinate states. We can judge only according to the amount of information that we posess what regions they might arise in, and if one is to generalize, I think that regional conflict is the most dangerous of all the dangerous factors now existing on the international scene. Thank you.

[Primakov] I would also like to speak. We should be equal in having the chance of agreeing or not agreeing with what each of us has to say.

I also categorically do not agree with Phil Stewart in that, first, there is allegedly a build-up of Soviet might taking place, or that the threat of alleged Soviet expansionism is a reason, so to speak, for the mistrust he speaks of, and even a reason for the development of some kind of conflicts.

[Seyjul-Mulyukov] And the fear of the American public?

[Primakov] The fear exists, but they are whipping up this fear. Public opinion is being manipulated, and we know frequently how they do it, Phil. Recently, for example, when Kalb resigned -- that is the deputy press officer at the State Department -- when he resigned it emerged why he resigned. Because through him the State Department was misinforming the American press, saying that Libya had allegedly prepared and carried out specific acts of terrorism. So this is how they manipulate public opinion and create it. So I don't think it is worth talking about fear of the Soviet Union in detail now, we don't have the time. You and we are all serious people, we understand that the Soviet Union is not interested in building up any kind of conflict situations. That's one thing.

The second aspect. You say that the most important issue to you is Afghanistan, and that it is precisely here that the Soviet Union should demonstrate what it is capable of. But I do not accept this point of view. I can say that for us there are very many conflict situations that we won't go into here that are for us very important; and even more important not strictly for us, but from the point of view of the stability or instability of the international situation. Take Central America, for example. Take the U.S. threat in Nicaragua. There's a legitimate government in place, which has, incidentally, armed its people -- and there's no government that is not supported by the people that is going to arms its people, that's perfectly clear -- and they are trying to overthrow it. I don't want, so to speak, to create any aggravation now, you're challenging me to do that. I simply would like to ask that we move on to some kind of specific core and examine specifically some situations. We would like, for example, to look at the Near East and also Afghanistan.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Let's take the Near East, as Harold Saunders, I think, wants to speak on this topic.

[Saunders] Well, first I would like to say that in the traditions of the Dartmouth discussions we do, as a rule, allow ourselves to move beyond the limits of mutual accusations and apportioning responsibility for one conflict or another. You see, our discussions are essentially of an analytical nature, that is, in any event, what normally happens, as distinct from the start of this current discussion between us. We try to look at what lies beneath the surface of one conflict or another. I'll now move on to the Near East, but for a moment I'd like as a simple commentary to say that the analytical basis that is traditionally adopted for the Dartmouth discussions does not require pronouncements of the type that one side is manipulating public opinion, but consists of recognizing the real fact, the basic, key fact, of the realities of the modern world. Our actions in Nicaragua, yours in Afghanistan make their own contribution to one public understanding or another of our intentions in one region or another, and while that is true of the modern world, our aim in these talks is to understand how the actions of one side are received by the official circles and the public of the other side, and to try to make this understood in a simple, undistorted and unmanipulated way.

Now, as far as the Arab-Israeli conflict is concerned, this happens to be a very good example of a regional conflict on which, as far as I recall, over almost a 20-year period now, starting from the 1967 war, the view of the United States has continually moved forward to a more perfect understanding of how American policy is perceived in the Soviet milieu. I find myself that I am much more prepared now than ever before to accept the view of Academician Primakov that the Soviet Union is interested in moving the Arab-Israeli conflict forward to the stage of settlement, to the stage of resolution. In the United States there are a fairly large number of people who think that the Soviet Union's interest lies in prolonging tention in this region and I personally do not accept this view, but there are wide circles that think that the Soviet Union is reaping the fruits of the prolonged contradiction and tension.

So what is essential for us is for each side to find its own means of demonstrating convincingly that the side we represent is ready to pay the known price in the currency of its own political capital in order to move forward the situation in the Near East to productive discussions, if not to a final settlement. Thus this forum provides us with an excellent analytical opportunity to discuss the measures that we could adopt to put an end to the tension in the Near East and to understand what paths to follow, what kind of talks to set up for the resolution of this conflict. Moreover, if the world public is to see, both on our part and on your part, a real desire to work for a solution to this conflict, then public opinion on both sides -- the misunderstanding or lack of understanding of real events o both sides will be considerably reduced, thus promoting the achievement of the aims of these talks.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Are you going to set out the Soviet position on a settlement of the conflict?

[Primakov] No, I just agree completely with Harold Saunders, that we need to think about some kind of constructive steps that could lead to settlement in the Near East. I am absolutely sure that we want that. That is precisely why the Soviet Union is proposing that a conference be held for a general settlement.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] An international conference.

[Primakov] Yes. There was, at one time, as they say, the Camp David agreement. And it was implemented, in an official capacity, by Bob Naumann, the very same, who took part in that process, serving under the administration of that time.

It is perfectly clear that, on the whole, the United States had already tried to make some sort of contribution. From our point of view, it was not a constructive contribution. We have plenty of proof of this: For example, after it, the separate agreement the United States was trying to impose in the Lebanon, was broken off. There was no further proposal, and no settlement of the Near East conflict came about. On the contrary, we then saw the annexation of the Golan Heights by the Israeli side following Camp David, and then the whole of Jerusalem was declared the capital...

[Seyful-Mulyukov -- interrupting] The sole and indivisible capital of Israel.

[Primakov] Yes, and incidentally, the United States will not accept this viewpoint officialy either.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] And there was the Israeli invasion of Lebanon.

[Primakov] That is exactly what I was going to say. There was also the invasion of the Lebanon. So it didn't work. There is another form of movement toward peace. That is a movement toward a general settlement, of course, with the participation of both the United States and the Soviet Union. But (?Harold) knows full well that the Kissinger school and that of the others who took over from him professed the view that the Soviet Union should be isolated from the process of a political settlement. In such conditions, of course, a political settlement in the Near East is inconceivable, just as it was without the United States, in fact. And now we have an idea.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Excuse me, if you would, Yevgeniy Maksimovich. I wanted to put in here that the main thing is that one cannot shut out all the interested parties from such a settlement in the Near East.

[Primakov] Yes, that is a correct forumulation of the question, and that is just what I wanted to move on to. At present, for example, we are proposing a general conference. Furthermore, we are proposing that some preliminary work be done to prepare for the conference, convening a preparatory conference first, for example, at the level of permanent representatives at the Security Council. Then, there must be mandatory participation in the conference by all, including the PLO naturally, which represents the Palestinian people. You realize, that without this, it can lead to nothing.

But unfortunately, there is no progress. And here, I'm sorry Phil, it is not a matter of Soviet military might. The fact is, that progress is being held up chiefly by the Reagan administration. I'm ready to argue this point. Let's hear your point of view.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] I believe Robert Naumann wants to enter the discussion.

[Naumann] I fear that our vast television audience will not receive its due of good heart and optimism if we continue accusing each other of heinous mutual crimes. [laughter] Let us consider these over and done with. Nothing can be done about the past, you understand, any more than you can force the toothpaste back into the tube. And I hope that our moderator will guide us with a firmer hand, and lead us through the channel, through the maze of our regional discussions before our time runs out.

[Kislov] That seems to me a very interesting and timely remark that Robert Naumann has just made. I am also convinced that to unblock conflict situations in the world collective efforts are required by all states either participating to any extent in the conflicts or able to exert any influence on their deterioration, or, on the other hand, on a settlement of them. It is precisely in the collective nature of the efforts that the guarantee of success lies. Indeed, the efforts of even many states can be wrecked by the stance of just one side. Just like in family life: you need the desire of at least two parties in order to live well. Just one party can wreck the happiness of the family.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Or a third party. [laughter]

[Kislov] It seems to me that this is precisely why those ideas and those proposals that concern the convocation of an international conference on the Near East and the preparation of this conference by means of talks within the framework of a preparatory conference in which the five permanent members of the Security Council could take part are ideas that are a very, very serious and sound foundation for successful progress toward a settlement of the Near East conflict.

I think that our discussions will still lead to our positions on this issue becoming closer and that we will succeed in influencing both American public opinion and the public opinion in many other countries — and Soviet public in this respect hardly needs any strong influence because in our country, as far as I know, the people are very concerned at the continuing tense situation in the Near East and would very much like real breakthroughs toward settlement of this conflict.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Harold Saunders, you want, in my view, to speak.

[Saunders] Let me just make one more quick comment about the Arab-Israeli conflict, and then let's move on to Afghanistan. I've got the impression that there are, so to speak, two factors that should be considered of paramount importance in examining the Arab-Israeli conflict. The Soviet side regards as paramount the need for international participation and international preparation for an international conference. But from the point of view of the preparation for such a conference, I would stress not just the technical aspect of this preparation, but also the political side. You understand, it is essential when moving into the future to have a clear understanding of what the obstacles impeding productive talks are, what specifically each of the sides can do to remove these obstacles from our path.

A similar problem exists in Afghanistan, too. We have held talks under the aegis of the United Nations Organization with the aim of working out some tangible aspects of an international accord that would permit the Soviet Union to put into practice its desire to withdraw its troops from Afghanistan. That is, it is essential that international talks take place in the most broad, complex and multinational context.

There is also a second factor in this picture, which is no less significant, and that is that the political process should be conducted in such a way as to be 100 percent directed toward the attainment of some kind of specific aim set by the international talks. Well, let's say, as far as a settlement in Afghanistan is concerned, the political process requires that we think about international approaches, about the international context, and on the other hand about what should happen on the domestic level in Afghanistan so that the Soviet troops can be withdrawn and so that a settlement acceptable for the opposing forces can be attained.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] We can say about the Near East that the conflict itself has lasted for some 30 years. I think that Harold Saunders has now involved us in a discussion of the situation around Afghanistan. I'll hand over to Vikto Grigoryevich Korgun, who has not yet managed to speak, and our time is coming to an end.

[Korgun] Thank you. Over recent days our discussion have demonstrated that Afganistan is truly a very complex problem, a problem that is complex both on the international level and on the level of the development of the domestic situation. However, I do not just think, I am convinced and believe that this is far from a hopeless problem. I can see a possibility — and my colleagues will support me in this — a possibility of resolving this problem in the near future.

On the one hand, a situation in many respects favorable for this is taking shape around Afghanistan, in the international context; and on the other hand, it is possible to observe a number of important processes unfolding within the country, processes that make it possible for us to speak of the establishment of favorable conditions for the process of stabilization, political stabilization above all.

Without doubt, one cannot deny that Afghanistan is now experiencing very difficult times: a prolonged war, economic difficulties, schools, mosques, and lines of communication in ruins. And this is not surprising. The progress of the Afghan people along the road of social progress is complicated by a great number of objective and subjective factors, many of which were inherited from by the present authorities from the previous antipeople regimes: economic backwardness, exceptional backwardness; the underdeveloped nature of the social structure of Afghan society; universal illiteracy; the influence of traditional factors -- a restraining influence, a braking influence; the presence of national, religious and other contradictions in Afghan society; the difficulty of transforming it, of bringing it on, in essence, from the middle ages into the nuclear age; and finally a factor which is not last in importance -- that of external interference, which has taken the form of a long-term, large-scale, undeclared war against a people who are waging a difficult struggle for their radiant future.

Nor do I wish to conceal from you difficulties of a subjective nature. The party heading this movement, the movement of its people along the path of social progress, is a young one. As yet it has little experience in running society and guiding its people. The party is in fact taking only its first steps on this path. An empirical quest is under way, a quest that is naturally accompanied by certain costs, as we say in the first stage of the revolution.

However, the time that has elapsed since the revolution gives us an opportunity to take a more sanguine view of the processes now beginning to develop in Afghanistan. In recent years, taking account of the mistakes of the previous leadership, the present government has developed a new and more flexible course in its social and political policy, a course already giving positive results, testifying to the creation of a new social climate in the country. First of all, we are dealing with a campaign unleashed on a national scale to expand the sociopolitical base of the regime, and of the April Revolution itself. The essence of this campaign lies in involving the most varied social strata of the Afghan people not only in participation in sociopolitical life, but also in the direct running of the state.

With the coming to power of the new party leadership in Afghanistan, the quest for dialogue, the quest for opportunities for cooperation with various political groups and forces, both in Afghanistan itself and in emigration beyond its borders, has substantially gained in strength. Very recently, Najibullah, the leader of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan [PDPA], speaking at the end of October this year, where about 100 journalists from various countries of the world were gathered...

[Seyful-Mulyukov -- interrupting] I was among the journalists at the time.

[Korgun] Najibullah plainly stated that Afghanistan now stands for the creation of a government of national unity, which can include representatives of any political parties or groupings prepared to uphold the laws of the DRA and cooperate with the regime in the name of achieving peace in Afghanistan.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Excuse me, Viktor Grigoryevich. In my opinion, you have fairly extensively set out the situation regarding a settlement. Robert Naumann, a former U.S. ambassador to Afghanistan, would like to enter this discussion. Do go ahead.

[Naumann] Thank you, I find myself somewhat optimistic as to the possibility of a settlement to the conflict in Afghanistan. But I am obliged to inform our audience that just as it once haunted Europe, at present a spectre is now haunting the tormented continent of Soviet-American relations. That spectre is Afghanistan.

The shock, the blow we felt in the United States from the invasion of that country by Soviet troops has not yet died away. It has not yet been overcome.

And, all the same, I am trying to view this question with a dispassionate eye. Having stood aside, I am trying to understand why this is happening the way it is -- not a shock, not an upheaval, but why is it that Afghanistan has become such an enormous problem. After all, it is an area of the world which, by virtue of its geographical position should also be close to the USSR in the essence.

When I was ambassador in Afghanistan, I fully accepted for myself this fact and I accept it now, too, namely that no matter what is said, no matter what is done, Afghanistan should maintain close and permanent relations with the USSR. We in the United States acknowledge and accept this fact. How, then, have we turned out to be in such an impasse -- because I remember these days very well indeed, the days of the closest possible cooperation between our Soviet colleagues and my own personnel, my staff, including me myself.

It only remains for me to feel regret that an opportunity for detente even prior to detente was let slip and this creates a tragic feeling. I witnessed the sudden seizure of power during the military coup that did not have the extensive support of the people, since it lacked barricades, an uprising, demonstrations, all that we usually link with a universal popular uprising. It is said to me that it is our intervention that is responsible for the situation that has taken shape. I want to emphasize that our aide to the freedom fighters in Afghanistan only commenced much later, after the April 1978 events; it began only after the Soviet invasion, after the Soviet troops were brought to Afghanistan. But even then, as today, our aid does not play the chief part. It is the Afghans themselves who should be the main actors on that stage, the chief figures on that arena.

We will not succeed in substituting ourselves for them during talks. Afghans are a proud people, a nation of proud people. They will accept national reconciliation only as a reconciliation between equals and not as a process involving personalities of one kind or another -- proud personalities, I repeat -- in the structure that has been created for them. No one will succeed in implementing this.

You see, the goal of any new political bodies -- governments or any other kind of bodies whatever -- consists in accomplishing two things. The first is to create sufficient stimulus for the fighters for freedom in Afghanistan to lay down their arms. No one will succeed in doing this from the sidelines. Afghans are a people cast in a completely different mold -- they will not allow this to happen.

Apart from that, it is necessary to spare a thought about how to put a stop to the sufferings and how to safely return approximately 4 million Afghans to the motherland -- a third of the population, currently living a life of misery abroad. This, likewise, will not be possible to attain, by us, or by you, or by any other third power whatever -- only by the Afghans themselves.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Yevgeniy Maksimovich wishes to say a few words.

[Primakov] Well, here one can, of course, provide, as it were, polemical asnswers to each of Bob's statements. However, I would simply like to say, to begin with, with regard to the revolution: Do believe us that we know what revolution is and our knowledge is not smaller than the knowledge about this in the United States. And we know how a revolution is done and whether the barricades are there or not, it is not an indicator of whether a revolution exists or not.

As for the structures that have been created for the Afghan people, of course I cannot agree with this, if only because well, you say that the United States began to help the so-called freedom fighters, as you call them -- we call them bandits and we have grounds to regard them as bandits. We do have grounds for this, because we see what they are doing. But, you say that the United States began to help only after the Soviet contingent entered there -- that is a question. But the fact that our contingent entered there not during the very beginning of the revolution, so as to create this structure, something that you are alluding to, but after that, when the necessity for this arose as a result of interference from outside and when the relevant request came through -- well, this is a fact that no one can dispute.

And now I wish to say something about the chief issue. In our discussion we always touch on this question and you ask us the question, well, when will the USSR withdraw its contingent from Afghanistan? The beginning is happening and our interviewer here, or the presenter of our broadcast, he himself has recently just arrived from there, as far as I know.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] I was there during the withdrawal of our six regiments and there were American journalists there, filming it all, both in Kabul and in other towns.

[Primakov] But the point is not only in numbers, for this operation has major political significance. But I want to say something about another thing. Well, believe me, there are two possibilities, real possibilities. As far as I understand, what we want is to withdraw our contingent from Afghanistan as quickly as possible, if appropriate guarantees are received against interference from outside. There is also a second possibility: When we are there and conditions become more and more stable, the situation becomes more and more stable -- and there is a tendency toward this -- and stabilization will take place even without it, so to speak, without guarantees against interference from outside -- and we will leave all the same. [sentence as heard] But this leaving will take place later and this is what we do not want, we want to do this earlier.

Now, how to do it earlier, that's the question. Well, Americans are often fond of saying that we need many ifs, as the Americans say. Thus: we want many ifs. Well, if the supply of assistance to these bandits is halted, if a halt is put now to the supply to them of the most up-to-date arms they use against aviation, if indeed conditions are created so that there is no action directed against Afghanistan from Pakistani territory -- and things are moving in this direction, isn't that so -- if a formula for national reconciliation is found, something everyone is talking about -- and that, too, is very important, you understand -- well, all these ifs taken together will amount to the construction of an edifice that will create certain guarantees and I think that then nothing more will be needed. We will then simply find a common language with the Afghans. As a matter of fact, we even have a schedule for the withdrawal.

[Seyful-Mulyukov -- interrupting] An agreed upon, stage-by-stage withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan...

[Primakov -- interrupting] With the Afghans [words indistinct] we do have an accord with the Afghans. But this must be implemented, and the ifs too, these many ifs.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Yes. Robert Naumann, please go ahead.

[Naumann] I have a very brief statement to make, in reply to what has just been said by my friend Yevgeniy and with which I am in full agreement. However, it is not victory in a discussion, but the attainment of results that is the goal of diplomacy. And the results are attainable only if we succeed in making all these factors compatible and hold talks on them as a package. I do not say simultaneously. Say one factor has been resolved, so it is removed. The troop withdrawal is essential. The creation of guarantees is essential. It is senseless to say: you should be first to withdraw the troops and only then will we undertake measures of one kind or another in response. It is senseless to say to the Soviet side: First you should put a halt to giving aid to the bandits, for no one will do this. All this is surrounded by conditions which must be solved jointly. However, the whole complexity of these conditions notwithstanding, if there is resolve to commence specific actions, we will succeed in resolving them.

[Seyful-Mulyukov] Well, here we apparently have to sign off. Our time on the air is drawing to an end. During the course of this television discussion among Soviet and American specialists on the problems of regional conflicts most various and, at times, polarized viewpoints were voiced and this is not surprising. I think that our television viewers are sufficiently well informed and prepared to draw their own judgement on the problems touched on during this television broadcast. One would like to hope that American television viewers, too, will see our television discussion. In conclusion: thank you to all the participants in our broadcast. Good-bye.

PRAVDA REVIEWS CEMA MEETINGS, U.S. ACTIVITIES

PM181635 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Nov 86 First Edition p 4

[Boris Kotov "International Review"]

[Text] Entering the 70th Year [subhead]

History is ticking away the first days of the 70th year of the new era which began with Great October. Our country entered its jubilee year mightier and more prosperous, rejuvenated and revitalized. The line of the Central Committee April Plenum and the 27th CPSU Congress is being consistently implemented. A major turnabout in Soviet society's development and a restructuring of a revolutionary nature are gathering pace. It is no accident that L'HUMANITE, the newspaper of the French Communists, noted in its 7 November issue: "The Soviet Union has not lost its role of trailblazer."

More than 1.5 billion people have chosen the socialist path of development. The peoples of the socialist community states march in the vanguard of builders of the new life. They share common goals and basically identical tasks concerning the acceleration of socioeconomic development, the enhancement of working people's well-being, and the struggle for peace and universal security. This is why mutual exchange of specific experience and coordinated actions in the foreign policy sphere acquire particular importance for these countries. The meetings of leaders of the community states' ruling parties have been an important aspect of this activity.

This work required a broader scope and greater intensity following the 27th CPSU Congress. The latest evidence of this was provided by the 10-11 November Moscow meeting of leaders of fraternal parties from CEMA's socialist countries: Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the USSR, and Czechoslovakia.

It was noted at the CPSU Central Committee Politburo's 13 November session that the CPSU positions outlined at the meeting are a practical expression of the line of intensifying the interaction of ruling communist and workers parties, the line of priority development of relations with socialist countries and the consolidation of world socialism.

The Moscow meeting discussed fundamental problems of the development and improvement of cooperation between socialist community countries and opportunities to reveal more fully socialism's creative potential. It was for this purpose that "particular attention was given to the further deepening of relations in the economic sphere and the utilization of new and most advanced forms of eoncomic, scientific, and technical interaction."

What lies behind these laconic words of the report on the Moscow meeting can be perceived in particular from the results of the scheduled 42nd sitting of the CEMA Session, held in Bucharest 3-5 November. It was decided there that one of the most important tasks is to develop widely such progressive forms of cooperation as direct business links and the establishment of joint enterprises, associations, and organizations operating on the basis of financial autonomy. A major practical step in this direction was taken by the signing of bilateral agreements between economic organizations of the USSR and of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, and the CSSR at head-of-government level during the session's work.

The Moscow meeting of leaders of the CEMA socialist countries' fraternal parties generated a broad international response. The Japanese newspaper YOMIURI, for example, notes in particular that the meeting participants supported the Soviet Union's principled stance in Reykjavik and emphasized the need to build up joint efforts in the interests of the struggle to eliminate nuclear weapons and reduce conventional arms, to strengthen peace and international security.

A Principled Line [subhead]

The strengthening of good-neighborliness and cooperation in the international arena is the principle and immutable line of the CPSU and the Soviet state. It also applies fully to our relations with states with different sociopolitical systems.

It was announced this week that M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will pay an official friendly visit to India at the end of November at the invitation of Indian Prime Minister R. Gandhi and the Indian Government. The forthcoming visit is a manifestation of the close and friendly relations existing between the two countries and peoples and will make a further contribution to the tradition of Soviet-Indian summit meetings. Both sides attach enormous importance to this visit as a noteworthy event in bilateral relations and a major step in the implementation of tasks concerning the strengthening of international peace and cooperation that are common for our two states and their leaders.

Soviet-Finnish relations also provide an example of how peaceful cooperation can and must be built between countries with different social systems. Developing on the firm foundation of the 1948 Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance between our two countries, these relations have a favorable effect on the improvement of the political climate in northern Europe and on the European Continent.

A CPSU delegation headed by Ye. K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has been in Finland in the last few days at the invitation of the Finnish Social Democratic Party [SSDP]. The most topical problems of the international situation and the workers movement and the prospects for Soviet-Finnish relations were discussed in the course of talks held with a SSDP delegation. The delegations briefed each other on their parties' activities and affirmed their reciprocal desire to continue to develop ties between the CPSU and the SSDP in the interest of strengthening friendly relations between our countries and of the struggle against the nuclear threat and for peace and security.

Speaking at a press conference in Helsinki 13 November, the head of the Soviet delegation dwelt on the question of consolidating security and stability in northern Europe. Having reminded those present that our country actively supports the proposal to create a nuclear-free north, he announced that, by way of augmenting and developing its position, the USSR has deemed it possible to take a number of new, specific, and weighty steps aimed at consolidating peaceful conditions in Europe's northern region. These steps include the already implemented dismantling of launch installations for medium-range missiles on the Kola Peninsula and of the majority of launch installations for such missiles in the remaining territory of the Leningrad and Baltic Military Districts, and the redeployment away from these districts of several divsions of operational-tactical missiles. It is also a question of the USSR's readiness -- provided agreement to allocate nuclear-free status to the Baltic Sea is reached between the states concerned -- to withdraw submarines armed with ballistic missiles from the Soviet Baltic Fleet. The USSR has further proposed to embark on limiting the intensity of major military exercises in norther Europe and its contiguous seas.

The world's news agencies, which immediately spread this important news, are now reporting numerous responses to it. Positive assessment of the USSR's new peace initiatives predominates in them. They are justly preceived by broad circles of the world public as a new demonstration of our country's good will and its desire to make a specific contribution to stengthening peace by means of practical deeds.

The results of the CPSU delegation's visit to Finland graphically demonstrate how fruitful contacts between peoples can be if they are based on such democratic principles as reciprocal respect for sovereignty and independence, noninterference in one another's internal affairs, equality, and honest partnership. This is particularly important at a time when the United States is not only ceasing but actually intensifying its attacks against these principles, against trust and cooperation in international relations.

Reykjavik: Two Approaches [subhead]

A striking example of how the U.S. Administration tramples the principles of civilized interstate contacts and honest partnership in international affairs is provided by its position of retreating from Soviet-U.S. accords on nuclear disarmament questions, a position which is dangerous for the fate of mankind. The month that has passed since the Reykjavik summit meeting has thrown a particularly strong light on this unseemly picture.

All this time, the dilligent efforts by official Washington and its subservient propaganda machine in the West have released upon the world wave after wave of political speculations, of biased or even downright dishonest interpretations of the course and results of the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Iceland. Mountains of lies and disinformation have been heaped up -- from attempts by the White House to "expropriate" the Soviet initiatives paving the way to a nuclear-free world right up to screams of delight about the USSR's "pliancy" only when faced with the U.S. "position of strength." [paragraph continues]

As if to confirm this, Washington announced the deployment of the new MX ICBM's at combat stations and the U.S. intention to exceed even before the end of this year the nuclear arms level set by the SALT II Treaty.

These steps were criticized even in the U.S. Senate. "It would be laughable if," Senator R. Byrd declared, for example, "only a month after Reykjavik, we were to make a 180-degree turn and offer to increase the number of strategic weapons." There is, however, very little to laugh about here. All this evidently became necessary in order to poison Soviet-U.S. relations, to attempt to revise the results of Reykjavik, and to deprive the peoples of the newly emerged hope. One gets the impression that, having overcome their temporary embarrassment, the U.S. military-industrial complex bosses, the nuclear manufacturers, and their helpers in the military departments ("The shock of Reykjavik," Britain's THE DAILY TELEGRAPH remarked, "shook even the Pentagon diehards") have decided to exact their revenge. They are making all-out efforts to tighten the militarist reins and force the "makers" of U.S. policy to turn back, abandoning to the mercy of fate the interests of their own people, of U.S. national security, and of universal peace.

The U.S. side's desire to wreck the accords reached in Reykjavik and to retreat to its pre-Reykjavik positions also took a practical, material form in the last few days. At the 5-6 November talks in Vienna with the USSR foreign minister, the U.S. secretary of state staged a show, as it was mildly put, of veritable political theater of the absurd. He put on the table before his interlocutor an amazing collection of papers, essentially negating everything the sides achieved in Reykjavik.

The most striking part of all this was the fact that the global solution found in Iceland to the central problem -- the liquidation of all USSR and U.S. nuclear arsenals, and primarily of strategic offensive weapons, over a 10-year period -- was purely and simply disclaimed.

Thus, Vienna saw the clash of two concepts, of two diametrically opposed approaches, E.A. Shevardnadze noted at his 10 November press conference. The Soviet Union desired to create a basis for practical implementation of the accords reached in Reykjavik. The United States attempted to establish positions leading to erosion of the Reykjavik soil.

This fact had a direct effect also on the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space weapons being held in Geneva. Despite the new proposals based on the Reykjavik accords and submitted there by the USSR 7 November, the sixth round of these talks which ended a few days ago failed to produce any practical results.

Caught Red-Handed [subhead]

Today, following an analysis of the post-Reykjavik situation, one cannot avoid the obvious conclusion: The myth about the "Soviet military threat" which people across the ocean have used in attempts to justify the sinister scheme of the "defensive" militarization of space is collapsing before the eyes of the world. Now it ought to be clear even to people in the West who are stupefied by propaganda manipulation that no military threat can originate from a country which, as the Soviet Union did in Iceland, proves by deeds its compete readiness for nuclear disarmament, its readiness for compromise and substantial concessions. Subject, of course, to reciprocity.

The opposite also applies. It is evident to any sober-minded person that the real threat to peace and the peoples' security stems from the militarist circles in the United States, which dictate to this great power a policy imbued with the ossified terminology of imperial and hegemonist thinking. [paragraph continues]

This can be seen not just in Washington's obstructionist approach to nuclear disarmament problems. Evidence of it can also be seen in numerous events occurring in different parts of the world.

The U.S. Administration was caught red-handed and for the whole world to see in the act of committing crude interference in Iran's internal affairs, using secret arms shipments to fan the already protracted and bloody Iran-Iraq conflict. The world public follows anxiously the intensive imperialist fueling of tension around independent Syria, which is falsely accused of complicity with some terrorists.

U.S. imperialism was also caught red-handed in Nicaragua, after taking interference in its internal affairs to the brink of armed aggression. Evidence of this is provided in particular by the Managua trial of the pilot of a U.S. aircraft which was shot down while delivering arms to gangs of counterrevolutionaries. It is highly indicative that the OAS session in Guatemala condemned the aggressive U.S. policy in Central America.

Yes, the shoots of realism that appeared to break through on the U.S. side in the Reykjavik days are again being trampled into the soil by the boots of militarist ambitions. Could it possibly be that the present White House incumbents intend to be remembered only for their policy of confrontation, military conflicts, illusory striving for military superiority, and sabotage of the disarmament cause?

A new situation has developed in international relations now, in the wake of Reykjavik. The peoples have seen for themselves the real prospect of and practical opportunity for creating a nuclear-free world. They are convinced: There is no turning back. And the way ahead, as M.S. Gorbachev noted, lies through the new political thinking, through awareness of the realities of the contemporary diversity in a contradictory and interconnected world.

WORLD TU CONGRESS SENDS MESSAGE TO GORBACHEV

PM051201 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Nov 86 First Edition pp 1, 2

["Message of the 11th World Trade Union Congress to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee" -- PRAVDA headline]

[Text] The 11th World Trade Union Congress was held in Berlin, the GDR capital, 16 through 22 September 1986 at a decisive and extremely dangerous moment in our history. The question consists in how events in the world will develop -- either human reason will gain the upper hand and realism will triumph in the name of the working people's interests, or the world will slide toward nuclear catastrophe and the destruction of mankind. Also we cannot tolerate the situation whereby vast material and intellectual resources are expanded on the arms race. It is disgraceful that approximately 1 trillion dollars a year are spent on military purposes -- more than the total income of the countries in which more than half our planet's population lives.

The congress is convinced that the arms race, particularly the nuclear arms race, which poses a direct threat to our planet's security and to life itself on earth, is today the chief obstacle to the balanced and comprehensive development of the world economy. It is rightly maintained that if mankind is not able to halt the arms race then the latter will destroy it.

Research by specialists indicates that ending the arms race will help to put an end to mass unemployment. This possibility must be taken into account against the background of the terrible growth in unemployment and underemployment from which many countries suffer.

The world trade union movement consistently strives for international agreements to halt and reverse the arms race. A specific proposal to conclude an agreement on a 10-percent cut in arms spending was advanced at the Second UN General Assembly Special Session in 1982. If that proposal had been adopted at that time, it would have been possible to secure considerable sums for profitable capital investments and to support international economic cooperation by increasing aid to developing countries and to millions of people who are today deprived of the means for a worthy existence.

The 11th World Trade Union Congress voices its resolute disagrement with any further escalation of the arms race and insistes that space be free of nuclear weapons, as the overwhelming majority of UN member states demands. What is needed to preserve security in the world is not the "Star Wars" strategy but the strategy of creating jobs, the strategy of combating poverty, and, as peace-loving forces throughout the world demand, the strategy of universal international security on the basis of friendship and cooperaton among all countries and peoples.

The 11th World Trade Union Congress supports all proposals by individual countries or groups of countries that make a contribution to the disarmament program. Therefore the congress welcomes the moratorium announced by the Soviet Union on nuclear weapon tests and calls on the United States and other nuclear powers to follow this example. The Soviet proposals for the destruction of nuclear weapons by the year 2000 accord with the wishes of working people and the peoples. The congress fully supports these initiatives aimed at ending the arms race and at disarmament, as well as the proposals advanced by the Eighth Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries in Harare at the beginning of September 1986 and by the "Delhi Six" countries in their "Mexico Declaration" and other disarmament initiatives by various political forces and mass organizations.

On behalf of 296 million organized working people on all continents the congress, at which 432 trade union organizations from 147 countries are represented, believes that the United Nations and all its members, primarily the United States and the USSR, must without delay take measures to conclude international agreements on ending the arms race and all nuclear tests, on eliminating nuclear and other kinds of mass destruction weapons, and on redistributing the funds released as a result of disarmament measures towards accelerating socioeconomic development. Measures must be taken in all countries to switch military enterprises to the production of peaceful output.

The congress once again states its conviction that the strategy of peace and disarmament has now become the decisive constituent part of the strategy of international development in ensuring a better life for all mankind.

The 11th World Trade Union Congress urges you to pay attention to these acute international problems and to take into account the hopes and aspirations of working people throughout the world, who have openly demonstrated at all levels their nonacceptance of the arms race.

CONTROVERSY CONTINUES OVER U.S.-IRAN ARMS SALES

Reagan Denies Shultz To Resign

LD181153 Moscow World Service in English 1000 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpts] President Reagan of the United States has said that is not planning new arms shipments to Iran. He made this statement on the background of the spreading political scandal connected with secret deliveries of American weapons and spare parts for military equipment to Iran. Mr Reagan refuted the rumors circulating in Washington as to the possible resignation of Secretary of State George Shultz who had expressed dissatisfaction with the failure to duly inform him of those transactions. [passage omitted] American arms shipments to Iran gave rise to indignation throughout the world because they are conducive to procrastinating the Iranian-Iraqi conflict.

NPR Disagreement Cited

LD190626 Moscow TASS in English 0622 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Text] Washington, November 19 (TASS) -- As a token of protest against the White House's secret deals with Iran, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz intends to tender his resignation, the NPR radio network reported on Tuesday with reference to sources in the administration of President Reagan.

The radio network also reported that the President asked George Shultz to remain at his post until the scandal caused by the exposures of the deliveries of U.S. weapons to Tehran subsides.

Turkatenko Commentary

LD181424 Moscow TASS in English 1310 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Washington November 18 TASS -- Follows commentary by TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko:

The White House has taken up all-round defence and is trying to beat back mounting attacks in connection with the exposure of its "contacts" with the Iranian "moderate" (from Washington's viewpoint) groupings and arms shipments to Iran. This is how the situation in which the U.S. Administration has found itself is characterised here.

They in Washington have apparently failed to hush up the scandalous affair. Moreover, there is ever new evidence confirming that the National Security Council made, by detour of congress and practically of the whole cabinet, purposeful efforts aimed at interference in Iran's home affairs and the Iran-Iraq war with the aim of keeping up its momentum. The "initiative" as regards the "contacts" and arms supplies to Iran was conceived and implemented jointly by Washington and Tel Aviv.

In trying to guard himself against criticism and indignation touched off in the Arab world and in other countries, as well as in the USA, President Reagan said on Monday that he did not intend to carry on arms shipments to Iran.

The journalists, who attended the press conference of Larry Speakes, White House deputy press secretary, held on the same day, could not help asking: What about the secret directive sealing the "initiative" vis-a-vis Iran? Could it be cancelled? Larry Speakes admitted that such a document really existed and was signed by the President on January 17, 1986. But Speakes said that nobody cancelled that document and it technically remained in force.

Israel, the client of the USA in the Middle East, which is banking on a continuation of the Iran-Iraq war, was in a hurry to help out the White House. The Israeli defence minister Yitzhak Rabin angrily rejected any assumption that Israel could supply Iran with weapons without Washington's approval. He said "Israel has never sold American arms or weapons containing American components without having received authorisation from the United States."

The impudence with which the White House acts in conflict with its own assurances about "strict neutrality" as regards the Iran-Iraq war, and is doing it even together with another state, has met with criticism even among the U.S. Administration.

OVCHINNIKOV ATTACKS WEINBERGER SUMMIT STRATEGY

PM181500 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Nov 86 First Edition p 5

[V. Ovchinnikov "Rejoinder": "Primitive Formula"]

[Text] The Pentagon chief delivered a speech in New York on a subject which would appear to have more to do with the State Department than the Defense Department: How to conduct talks with the Soviet Union. The speaker began, according to custom, with an introduction. For some decades, he said, the Americans have witnessed how NOT [capitalized work printed in boldface] to conduct talks with Moscow. And then, in Reykjavik, the President taught everyone a lesson...

What is instructive about that lesson? In Weinberger's opinion, you must follow four rules in dealing with the Russians. First: exclude any idea of "moral equivalence." The most serious error is to believe that the peoples of the United States and the Soviet Union can have "common hopes and aspirations."

The second rule embodies the cult of strength. The United States, the Pentagon chief states bluntly, must become strong before starting talks with the Soviet Union. Otherwise it can never achieve agreements which meet America's interests.

Weinberger's third rule recommends taking into account the fact that it is easier for Soviet leaders to adopt decisions in the course of talks. (If you remember the U.S. Administration's profound dependence on the military-industrial complex, here one can, perhaps, agree with Weinberger.)

Lastly, rule four: When conducting talks, take a long-term view. The Russians, he says, can plan their actions far in advance and regard that as an advantage. The Americans feel discouraged when talks drag on. Reagan, he says, only had to show implacability on the question of SDI for the public to start making a fuss about "lost opportunities" and "dangerous consequences." From all this Weinberger concludes: Patience and determination to restore U.S. military might — that is the key to successful talks with the USSR.

Those are the views of the head of the military department of the leading capitalist power. It is pointless to seek even a glimmer of a new way of thinking, even a hint of an awareness that security in the nuclear age can no longer be identified with force, that for the USSR and the United States security can only be mutual, and in global terms it can only be universal. Nor is there any sign of an awareness of the inescapable truth that for all the contradictions of the modern world, peoples and states have a common interest: to prevent nuclear catastrophe and deliver mankind from death.

Weinberger's "four rules" smack of primitive anticommunism from the arsenal of Truman, who at one time tried in vain to blackmail the Soviet Union with the American monopoly of atomic weapons. Indeed, history also teaches us that some people do not learn from history.

CANADA RESUMES SCIENTIFIC, CULTURAL CONTACTS

LD141450 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 14 Nov 86

[Text] Ottawa November 14 TASS -- The Canadian Government has decided to resume contacts with the Soviet Union in the field of science, education and culture, Joseph Clark, Canadian external affairs minister, told journalists in Toronto.

He recalled that the programme of exchanges and cooperation between the USSR and Canada in science, education and culture was unilaterally cancelled by the Canadian Government in December, 1979 in the hope to get a change in the USSR's stand in connection with the developments around Afghanistan.

"I think that clearly the cutting off of relations with the Soviet Union (in the afore-mentioned areas) did not have the effect that we sought," Clark said.

The statement by the Canadian external affairs minister is an added proof that the sanctions imposed against the Soviet Union by the ruling quarters of a number of NATO countries under pressure from Washington have suffered a fiasco and only caused definite damage to those countries' normal relations with the Soviet Union.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON BILATERAL TALKS WITH JAPAN

Gerasimov Briefs Press

LD181510 Moscow TASS in English 1500 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS -- Regular consultations between the Foreign Ministries of the USSR and Japan at the level of deputy foreign ministers were held in Moscow on November 13-14, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said at a briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists at the press center of the USSR Foreign Ministry today.

The Soviet side was represented at the consultations by Mikhail Kapitsa, the Japanese side -- by Shin'ichi Yanai.

Shin'ichi Yanai was received by Eduard Shevardnadze, foreign minister of the USSR.

The sides discussed international problems and also issues of mutual interest, Gerasimov said. The Soviet side stressed the importance of the interaction of all states in the interest of consolidating the foundations of international security.

They expressed the view that there existed ample opportunties for cooperation between the USSR and Japan in the context of the broad programme to promote peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region. The Soviet side confirmed the USSR's principled line for developing the relations of goodneighbourliness with Japan and underlined the importance of both sides' efforts in this direction.

The consultations passed in a tranquil and businesslike atmosphere under the angle of the quest for ways to upgrade Soviet-Japanese relations. Gerasimov said.

KYODO on Gorbachev Visit

OW150121 Tokyo KYODO in English 0100 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, Nov. 15 KYODO -- Japan's hope for Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to visit Japan in January has become almost impossible to materialize.

This was learned Friday night at the end of the Moscow talks between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Shinichi Yanai. During the sixth Japan-USSR regular consultations, Shevardnadze said Gorbachev is hopeful of visitng Japan, meeting Japanese people and talking with Japanese leaders. However, he said more time is necessary to decide on what the Japan visit should be, he told Yanai. Because the prospects for the Soviet-U.S. relations are not so clear, the Soviet Union could not say more at present about the Japan visit other than what Shevardnadze told Japanese Foreign Minister Tadashi Kuranari in New York in September, he said.

Gorbachev's diplomatic schedule for next year has not yet been finalized, Shevardnadze told Yanai, according to Japanese sources.

Since the Japanese side earlier considered that if Gorbachev visits Tokyo in January, Japan would have to start preparation for the event around this month, the latest Soviet reply in effect terminates any plan for a January visit.

Shevardnadze said the Soviet Union would not drop Gorbachev's Japan visit from his future diplomatic schedule in reply to Yanai's statement that Japan hoped to get a response on the matter as soon as possible, the Japanese sources said. After the meeting, Yanai said Japan has to wait and see the Soviet decision on the matter and declined to speculate further about Gorbachev's visit. Both sides also failed to progress in talks on the Japanese territorial claim over the four Soviet-held islands east of Hokkaido, which fell into Russian hands at the end of World War II, the sources said.

On the Soviet-U.S. summit in Reykjavik in October, Shevardnadze told Yanai that the Soviet Union puts the utmost importance on the results of the summit and would never retreat from the results achieved at Reykjavik. The Soviet foreign minister also told Yanai about Soviet concerns related to Japan's participation in the U.S. strategic defense initiative (SDI) research project, the sources said.

INSTITUTE DIRECTOR ADDRESSES ASIA-PACIFIC FORUM

LD181816 Moscow TASS in English 1800 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS -- The Asian-Pacific region is the most troubled area in the world. It is precisely there that most hotbeds of local and international conflicts are situated, director of the institute of the Far East of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Mikhail Titarenko said this addressing today an international scientific conference "international relations and topical problems of ensuring peace and security in the Far East". Even though the scopes of the militarization of the area are so far lower than in Europe, the pace of the militarization is dangerously stepped up. Problems of the Asian-Pacific region can no longer be viewed apart from the overall international situation in the world of today.

The Soviet Union's approach to matters of security in Asia is not governed by circumstantial considerations, Mikhail Titarenko said. This is a long-time and principled line which is dictated by the Soviet Union's interest in peaceful conditions for successful socialist construction.

We declare for he convocation of an Asian forum for joint quest of constructive solutions, Mikhail Titarenko said. This will make it possible to establish points of contact, to work out the common princples of conduct and concerted interests of states in the nuclear-space age. The holding of such a forum will be promoting detente in Asia. At the same time it is necessay to implement a range of measures in the military, political and economic spheres which would make it possible to enhance the confidence of every state in its security. Such measures of confidence must be implemented on a regional and subregional levels both on a bilateral and multilateral basis.

MOSCOW RALLY BACKS PYONGYANG YOUTH FESTIVAL BID

LD172237 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 17 TASS -- The Soviet young people back a proposal by the Union of the Socialist Working Youth of Korea on holding the 13th World Festival of Youth and Students in Pyongyang in the summer of 1989, said today Vladimir Aksenov, chairman of the USSR Committee of Youth Organizations, at a youth mass rally in Moscow. The holding of the world festival of young people on the Asian continent for the first time, he noted, would help draw new forces of youth and students into the festival movement and the campaign for turning the Asian and Pacific region into a zone of peace and cooperation.

PAPER CLAIMS SEOUL IGNORES DPRK OVERTURES

PM171123 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Nov 86 Second Edition p 5

[A. Golts "Rejoinder": "Too Much Crow Meat"]

[Text] Judging by reports from Seoul, the leaders of the South Korean regime are eating crow meat almost every day. No, not because they are starving. Although the country's foreign debt has topped the 40 billion dollar mark long ago, this has not affected the living standards of the ruling circles. Washington rewards its most loyal friends generously.

The crow has become part of their diet for another reason. According to a popular superstition in Korea, anyone who tastes crow meat completely loses his memory. And memory is only an impediment to those who rule in Seoul. How, let me ask you, can you keep stepping up the militarist psychosis in South Korea, how can you keep shouting at every opportunity about the "threat from the North," if you constantly remember the DPRK's many peace initiatives? And so eating crow meant is most appropriate. Having eaten this "game," if you can call it that, it is considered fair game to talk any sort of nonsense about the policy of people's Korea.

This is obviously what the author of the latest appeal to the regime's army has done. Going beyond the usual statements that "a sudden attack by North Korea is possible," the appeal claims that the DPRK has completed preparations for such an attack by "switching all its forces to the vicinity of the border." In making this claim they managed to "forget" that in its efforts to reduce tension in the Korean peninsula the DPRK Government has recently adopted a decision to dispatch 150,000 servicemen to work at key national economic projects and that entire units of the Korean People's Army have of late been withdrawn from the area bordering on the demilitarized zone.

But this is not the only thing that Seoul has chosen to forget. The address contains absurd claims that the DPRK is allegedly preparing a "chemical attack." The South Korean rulers prefer not to mention that it was the American who more than 30 years ago dropped toxins on Korea. They also prefer not to recall that quite recently, in April, Washington announced its decision to deploy binary chemical munitions in the southern part of the peninsula.

As you can see, the memory of the pillars of the South Korean regime is quite poor. "They have eaten too much crow meat," is what they say about such people in Korea.

COMPARISON ON SHEVARDNADZE-YANAI TALKS

Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian on 16 November in its Morning Edition on page 5 carries under the general heading "Conversations at the USSR Foreign Ministry" a report on a conversation which took place in Moscow between USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and Japanese Deputy Foreign Minister Sinichi Yanai. This has ben compared with the Moscow TASS English Version report published in the 17 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page C 1. It is virtually identical with the exception of the following variations:

Paragraph three, line three reads in IZVESTIYA: ...All peoples. The solution of the most...(changing 'settlement' to 'solution')

Penultimate paragraph, line three reads: A radical turn towards better in Soviet-Japanese relations would serve the interests of both countries, the cause of peace and security in the Far East and in the Asian-Pacific region as a whole. (omitting: 'best,' changing 'Middle East' to 'Far East')

NEW TIMES INTERVIEWS DRA LEADER NAJIBULLAH

PM111145 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No. 44, 10 Nov 86 pp 12-14

[Interview with Najibullah, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, by special correspondent Leonid Mironov: "Najibullah: Renewal in All Spheres of Life"]

[Text] [Question] Comrade Najibullah, eight and a half years have passed since the April revolution of 1978. How do you define the main content of the present situation in the country?

[Answer] By its nature and content the April revolution is national-democratic, anti-feudal and anti-imperialist. It was carried out in pursuance of the national interests and the aspirations of the broad popular masses, in the name of the ideals for which Afghan patriots, progressive and democratic forces have struggled for many years.

A process of renewal is now taking place in all spheres of life -- social, economic, political and cultural. The country is shaking off the fetters of feudalism, backwardness and ignorance. In the time since April 1978 the revolution has dealt a crushing blow to all forms of national and social oppression, to the feudal-bureaucratic regime that for centuries had doomed the people to a life of oppression and poverty.

Within a short period of time a state of a new type -- a democratic republic -- has been created on the ruins of backward feudal-bureaucratic Afghanistan, formerly ironically described by Western journalists as "a splinter of the Middle Ages wedged-in amongst the Hindu Kush Mountains." The young working class and the broad masses of the peasantry now form the political bases of our society, and their firm alliance guarantees the safeguarding of the interests of all the other patriotic-minded sections of the population.

I would formulate the top-priority tasks facing the party and the republic at present as follows: the defence of our independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity; the strengthening of the gains of the April revolution; the ensurance of broad and active participation of all working people and the other patriotic forces in the national-democratic transformation; and making Afghanistan a developed, flourishing state.

The democratic republic's enemies -- the imperialists, regional reactionaries and counterrevolutionaries -- are not above openly lying and resorting to malicious fabrications. They try to ascribe to the April revolution intentions that it never had; they gloat over the errors made by the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan and allege that we are stagnating. We are revolutionaries and for this reason are not afraid to speak about our weaknesses, and we do everything we can to overcome them.

[Question] People from various provinces -- workers, peasants, craftsmen and representatives of tribes -- very often come to the afghan capital. Recently, I understand, you and other members of the Political Bureau of the PDPA CC have designated certain days on which you receive these people. What do you talk about with them?

[Answer] Not long ago I travelled to a number of provinces, visited many enterprises and addressed meetings. In short, I tried to have as much contact with people as possible. I also receive more than fifty people a month. To be closer to the masses -- this is what we now demand of all PDPA officials. During our conversations with working people the most pressing issues and problems are dealt with. It also happens, of course, that people come with specific requests, which we do our best to fulfil. We must not isolate ourselves from the people, we must not hide from them in air-conditioned offices. People taken as a whole are wiser and more experienced than any leader. Therefore we must learn from them. All members of the Political Bureau of the PDPA CC take turns receiving the public at the Delkush palace every day. Incidentally, ordinary people used to be denied access to this palace.

[Question] In the course of your contacts with the Afghan working people have you noticed any changes in them?

[Answer] Definitely. Considerable changes have taken place in people, in ordinary Afghan working people who are becoming the masters of their country. For instance, the workers and office employees of the Junkalak automobile repair plant, the house-building complex and mechanized bakery in Kabul and the textile mill in Bagram not only regularly fulfil and overfulfil their production assignments, but also protect their enterprises round-the-clock from possible attacks by counterrevolutionary bands. In this country Friday is the day off. But the workers of these enterprises often come to work even on Fridays. Hashars, days of volunteer work somewhat similar to your subbotniks, are being increasingly practised in this country. Thanks to them schools and bridges have been repaired, streets cleaned, a hospital constructed in Balkh Province and dozens of homes built for the families of those who fell for the revolution. Out of the money earned during hashars these families were given material assistance amounting to more than 500,000 afghani. These few examples are evidence of the changes in our people, who are displaying a new attitude to work, to their people's state.

[Question] Frequently you meet with Afghan ulema. Don't they complain that the new regime is ignoring the country's religious specificities?

[Answer] Such contentions of Western propaganda are totally false and cause revulsion among our ulema, well-educated theologians, with whom I meet. Recently I went to the Ministry for Islamic Affairs and Waqfs and spoke to officials there. They had no complaints, only requests and suggestions. When on business trips, I visit mosques and talk to members of the congregations. We do everything to ensure the best conditions for the observance of religious rites.

The leaders of the counterrevolution use every opportunity to make shrill statements that they are sending "fighters for the faith" to battle for the "sacred Koran," which supposedly is in danger. These incantations are aimed at illiterate and ignorant people. A part of the population still falls for the exhortations of the counterrevolutionaries and Western propaganda, but this is mainly due to ignorance and backwardness. These people were downtrodden in the past and this tells. But more and more of our Muslims, when they learn what we are doing for them, are beginning to see the light. During the past five years 231 mosques were built and 1,026 repaired, with 270 million afghani of state funds spent on that. During the same period counterrevolutionary bands of "fighters for the faith" destroyed 254 mosques. During this time more than 25,000 Muslims went on pilgrimages to Mecca with state assistance. The state spent an average of 26,600 afghani on each pilgrim, a total of 726 million. Quite a large sum, as I'm sure you will agree. [paragraph continues]

The DRA government pays the salaries of 11,570 mullahs in 5,167 mosques. The state finances the theological department of Kabul University and 20 madrasahs (religious schools). Preparations for the opening of the Islamic Institute are in full swing in Kabul. As you see, genuine concern is shown for the needs of Muslims, but it is still being stubbornly claimed that we are oppressing somebody.

The social status of the overwhelming majority of the Muslim clergy in Afghanistan is close to that of the working population. That is why they are interested in ensuring social justice and in improving the working people's living conditions. The patriotic section of the clergy is actively joining the socioeconomic transformations, supporting the aims and tasks of the national-democratic revolution and taking part in the work of the executive branches of state administration and public organizations.

[Question] The PDPA and the government are directing their efforts at overcoming economic and social backwardness. In March of this year Afghanistan started fulfilling a five-year plan. What place does this hold in the solution of these problems?

[Answer] Despite the undeclared war unleashed against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the unceasing armed incursions by groups of bandits we are doing everything possible to develop the economy and improve the population's life. The five-year plan pursues precisely these aims. It provides for an accelerated development of the key branches of the national economy and raising the material and cultural standards of the people's life. We have worked out a programme for drawing local businessmen into economic development. By the end of the five-year period, we estimate, national income will have grown by 25 per cent, industrial output by 38 per cent and gross agricultural output by 14-16 per cent.

Though its fulfilment will require considerable effort, it is a realistic plan. I can say already that we have made a good start. For the first time all the industrial ministries are successfully coping with their assignments. The six-month plan of industrial output in the public and mixed sectors was fulfilled by 110.8 per cent. The private industrial sector is operating well. There are changes for the better in agriculture. New irrigated areas have been put to use and the state is giving effective assistance to peasants by providing them with credits, seeds and fertilizers.

The social sphere is being further developed. We are building new schools and hospitals, the enrolment of children in elementary schools is gradually growing as well as of students in establishments of higher and secondary education. We regard the economic front as being as important as the military one.

[Question] The nomads were always considered the most deprived part of the Afghan population. During my trips to Paktia, Nangarhar, Qandahar, Zabol and other provinces I saw numerous tent settlements serving as temporary camps for nomads. Will these nomads be encouraged to switch to a settled way of life? If so, how?

[Answer] The Ghilzai, Durrani and some other tribes lead a nomadic way of life. They are all citizens of our republic for whom we must show concern. Eventually they will all become permanently settled. The development of socially backward areas where national minorities and nomads live will be accelerated, and these people will be ensured, on a just basis, their proper representation in the central and local state and public bodies, in the National Fatherland Front.

[Question] Late last August in Jalalabad you said in a speech, "We do not need war, enough! We must achieve accord, and respect mutual interests." With whom and on what basis is this accord to be achieved?

[Answer] Among the pressing tasks of our policy we include the creation of such conditions throughout the country in which outstanding issues could be solved jointly, peacefully, without the use of arms, in an atmosphere of trust, cooperation and brotherhood, on the basis of ensuring national interests and national accord. Our policy, directed at expanding the revolution's social base, and our new approach to these matters, imply a readiness for broad cooperation on a national scale in the interests of the entire people. This readiness presupposes:

The inclusion in the leading state bodies, i.e., the Revolutionary Council and the Council of Ministers, of non-party people who command respect and express the interests of various sections and groups of the population; The broadening of dialogue with those groups that from a lack of understanding still hold hostile positions to the revolution but may be expected to repent their anti-national counterrevolutionary activities; The possibility of flexible compromises on a principled basis in the name of national accord, establishing peace in the country and ensuring its security.

We call on all our countrymen to take an active part in the country's historic renewal and national rebirth. The arms of the motherland are open to all countrymen who are abroad. In conditions of guaranteed security, respect for human dignity and absence of discrimination we will give them an opportunity to join the cause of building a flourishing independent Afghanistan.

[Question] Does any basis exist for settling relations with Pakistan?

[Answer] We live with the people of Pakistan in one region and wish to live in peace, to cooperate in the struggle against backwardness, for social and economic progress. History made us neighbours and neighbours should live peacefully, should not shoot at each other.

Afghanistan has never interfered in the internal affairs of other countries, including the internal affairs of Pakistan. We have always been opponents of such interference. But it should be noted that Pakistan has become a springboard of the undeclared war against the DRA unleashed by the forces of imperialism and reaction headed by the United States. Every sensible person cannot fail to understand that such subversive activites damage both the Afghan and the Pakistani people. The peoples of our countries can benefit only from relations of good-neighbourliness and mutual respect.

I think there are no obstacles to improved relations between Afghanistan and Pakistan, to our cooperation. The government of Pakistan should finally head the will of its own people and stop serving as an accomplice in carrying out Washington's perfidious plans. We would like once again to draw the attention of the Pakistani authorities to the well-intended initiatives of the DRA, to the important step taken by the Soviet Union, which has just withdrawn six regiments of the limited contingent of Soviet troops in the country.

[Question] I am interviewing you on the day when the last of these six Soviet regiments is leaving Afghan territory. Do you think this measure is enough to stimulate a political settlement in the region?

[Answer] Speaking in Konduz at the send-off ceremony for a motorized infantry regiment, I said that this withdrawal was a step of good will that should become a new impulse for scaling down the undeclared war and stopping the aggression conducted from abroad. We hope that those who organize and carry out the armed intervention against us will appreciate this step. But they should also know that if this intervention continues our great friend, the Soviet Union, will not fail us in our time of need.

[Question] I thank you, Comrade Najibullah, for finding the time to give such detailed answers to my magazine's questions. Soon my country will be celebrating the 69th anniversary of the Great October Revolution. What would you like to say to he Soviet people through NEW TIMES on the eve of this holiday?

[Answer] Our friendship with the Soviet Union is as eternal as the world we live in. It is vivifying as a stream of water. Years and decades will pass, our children and grandchildren will grow up and carry further the pure banner of friendship between our countries. We will always remember what the Soviet Union has done for our democratic republic, indeed, for all of us.

On the eve of the anniversary of the Great October Revolution, which opened a new era in the history of mankind, I convey on behalf of the entire Afghan people wishes of happiness and prosperity to our great friend -- the people of the land of Lenin.

DRA MEDICS CLAIM 'BANDITS' USE CHEMICAL WEAPONS

LD171409 Moscow TASS in English 1337 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Kabul November 17 TASS -- "The AP agency report on the death in Kabul's military hospital Wazir Akbar Khan of two officers and five soldiers, who by some accident were exposed to poison gases used by Soviet troops, is an utter lie," said Major General of the Medical Service Dr. Wilayat Habib, superintendent of that hospital. "No patients suffering from the effects of chemical agents were enlisted at the hospital from September to October. Neither the Soviet, nor the Afghan troops in Afghanistan have chemical weapons, and have never used them. Chemical weapons are used in Afghanistan only by counter-revolutionary bandits," he said in an interview with a correspondent of the NOVOSTI Press Agency.

A statement to the same effect has been made by leading surgeon of a civil hospital Wazir Akbar Khan, Munawar Khaled. He said: Neither in September nor in October people suffering from toxic chemicals came to us. Yet, still undergoing a course of treatment at our hospital, are two patients -- shepherd Shaista Khan from Ghazni and peasant Amin Jan from Pakitia who came to us in the summer of this year. Both suffered as a result of the use of chemical weapons by the bandits. But their life is not in danger. Unfortunately, a year ago we failed to save the lives of four people who were badly injured by chemical agents supplied by the CIA to the counter-revolutionaries.

SHEVARDNADZE, BULGARIAN ENVOY HOLD 'WARM' TALK

LD182134 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1758 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow, 18 Nov (TASS) -- Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, today received Georgi Pankov, member of the BCP Central Committee and Bulgarian ambassador to the USSR.

During the course of a warm and friendly converstion, satisfaction was expressed at the dynamic development of Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation. The determining role of the meetings and conversations between Mikhail Gorbachev and Todor Zhivkov for the further deepening of Soviet-Bulgarian relations was noted. The course toward the acceleration of socioeconomic development, worked out at the 27th CPSU Congress, and the decisions of the 13th BCP Congress ensure favorable conditions for all-round interaction between the USSR and Bulgaria.

Profound satisfaction was expressed at the results of the working meeting in Moscow of the leaders of the fraternal parties of the socialist member-countries of CEMA, which is of exceptionally important significance for the development and perfection of cooperation and a more complete exposure of the creative potential of socialism.

The necessity of increasing efforts in reinforcing the boundaries [po zakrepleniyu rubezhey] on the path to nuclear disarmament which were achieved at Reykjavik was stresssed. It was pointed out in this regard that the complex of Soviet initiatives remains in force and forms a platform which offers a historic chance for a fundamental solution to the problems of war and peace.

Georgi Pankov noted that the government and people of Bulgaria fully support the USSR's energetic foreign policy and the major Soviet foreign policy initiatives aimed at strengthening peace and general security, to halt the arms race, and prohibiting nuclear and space weapons.

Bulgaria's constructive activity in the international arena, which is a significant contribution to the common cause of struggle for peace and international security, was highly assessed.

In conclusion Eduard Shevardnadze wished the ambassador success in his reponsible work in further strengthening Soviet-Bulgarian friendship and increasing the efficacy of our cooperation.

BRIEFS

BULGARIAN PRODUCTION ASSOCIATION -- A joint Soviet-Bulgarian scientific production association, Ivanovo-Sofia, has been set up in accordance with the comprehensive program of the CEMA countries. It will develop various types of machine tools. [Summary] [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0001 GMT 11 Nov 86 LD]

TASS CRITIZES REMARKS BY NORWEGIAN COMMANDER

LD181919 Moscow TASS in English 1848 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS -- By TASS military writer Vladimir Chernyshev

The discussion of problems of establishing a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe is an integral part of the efforts to reduce the nuclear arsenals on the continent and a step towards the complete eradication of nuclear weapons.

Quite naturally, all who are interested in strengthening peace in northern Europe have positively assessed the USSR's latest initiatives announced in Helsinki by Yegor Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

They were, first of all, a concrete confirmation of the Soviet Union's readiness to consider substantial measures with regard to its own territory adjoining the would-be non-nuclear zone.

Secondly, they were a practical support for the idea of possible confidence-building measures in respect to the northern region and the adjacent seas.

There are, however, certain quarters in Scandinavia which did not like the Soviet initiatives. For instance, the commander-in-chief of the Norwegian Armed Forces, General Fredrik Bull-Hansen, tried to reduce their impact on public opinion in an interview with the newspaper AFTENPOSTEN.

He said he doubted that the USSR had really dismantled the medium-range missile launchers in the Kola Peninsula and a large part of such launchers in the rest of the territory of the Leningrad and the Baltic military districts.

What was happening in reality, the general claimed, was the replacement by the Soviet Union of the outdated SS-5 missiles with new SS-20's.

Does Bull-Hansen have a reliable source of information? Far from that. He merely repeats the obvious lie concocted by a certain Tomas Rais, a self-proclaimed "Finnish expert on Soviet arms in northern Europe."

Rais assumed the title on the strength of the fact that his mother was born in Finland (but long since left that country).

Why has the Norwegian general picked up the hoax? Is he not one of those who, in a bid to thwart the process of nuclear disarmament, started claiming after Reykjavik that nuclear weapons are a good thing?

The British newspaper OBSERVER meant precisely such generals, when it said that they felt more comfortable with nuclear arms, while the renunciation of nuclear arsenals was tantamount to the threats to strip them down to their underwear.

The commander-in-chief should recall the latest statement by Norwegian Prime Minister Gro Harlem Brundtland that the current Norwegian Government, like the previous ones, regarded the development of relations with the neighbouring Soviet Union as an important goal.

The general's lie can hardly correspond to the Norwegian Government's policy.

ISLAMIC CONFERENCE SECRETARY GENERAL RECEIVED

Talks With Kapitsa 15 Nov

LD151420 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 15 TASS -- There was a conversation at the USSR Foreign Ministry today between USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Mikhail Kapitsa and Secretary-General of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference Sayid Sharaf al-Din Pirzada, now on a brief working visit in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Government. The conversation passed in a businesslike astmosphere. USSR First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov gave a luncheon in honour of Sharaf al-Din Pirzada on November 14. Yuliy Vorontsov and Sharaf al-Din Prizada exchanged speeches.

Shevardnadze-Pirzada Talks

PM171423 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 5

["Conversations in the USSR Foreign Ministry" -- IZVESTIYA headline]

[Text] Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, has met and talked on 14 November with Sharaf al-Din Pirzada, secretary general of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, who is currently on a brief working visit in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

The conversation covered a broad range of issues pertaining to the present-day international situation.

The guest's attention was drawn to the Soviet Union's persistent efforts aimed at ridding mankind speedily and completely of the nuclear threat, strengthening mutual understanding, cooperation and trust among nations, and creating an all-embracing international security system.

Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that, thanks to the Soviet side's initiative, advances toward historical frontiers along the path toward nuclear disarmament were made at the Reykjavik meeting of the USSR and U.S. leaders.

Today the task of all states, movements, public organizations, and individual political figures is to consolidate these advances and contribute towards further progress on the issue of disarmament and on strengthening peace. To that end it is necessary to overcome the ambition of the USA to put into outer space the latest types of dangerous weapons under the pretext of creating a "defense" SDI system.

The pressing need was stressed by both sides for reaching through collective efforts a just and all-embracing settlement of the Near East conflict, at whose heart is the Palestinian problem. It was pointed out that putting an end as soon as possible to the senseless Iran-Iraq war and a political settlement of the conflict would accord with the interests of both countries and contribute to an improvement of the international situation as a whole.

In examining the situation around Afghanistan, Eduard Shevardnadze stressed that the return home from that country of six Soviet regiments is a manifestation of the Soviet Union's goodwill, its constructive contribution to a settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. Further steps in that direction will depend on whether an end is put to armed interference in the home affairs of the Afghan people or not. Sharaf al-Din Pirzada showed interest in new elements in the field of settlement around Afghanistan.

The secretary general of the Organization of the Islamic Conference spoke about the organization's activities, expressed sincere gratitude for the warm reception accorded to him in Moscow, and declared support for continuing contacts.

Pirzada Departs Moscow 16 Nov

LD161245 Moscow TASS in English 1159 GMT 16 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 16 TASS -- Sayid Sharaf al-Din Pirzada, general secretary of the Organisation of the Islamic Conference, today departed from Moscow. He was staying in the USSR on a short working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

GEN IVANOVSKIY RETURNS FROM SYRIA 15 NOV

PM181245 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Nov 86 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Visit Completed"]

[Text] On 15 November of this year Army General Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, commander in chief of the Ground Forces and USSR deputy defense minister, who was in Syria on an official visit, returned to Moscow.

Colonel General D.A. Grinkevich, Colonel General B.P. Ivanov, and other generals and officers met Army General Ye.F. Ivanovskiy at the airport.

MOLDAVIAN OFFICIAL, DELEGATION RECEIVED IN IRAQ

LD171909 Moscow International Service in Arabic 1530 GMT 17 Nov 86

[Text] Taha Yasin Ramadan, Iraqi first deputy prime minister, received a delegation of Soviet Societies of Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, led by the first deputy chairman of the Moldavian SSR Council of Ministers, who are currently visiting Iraq. During the talks the importance of extending cooperation between the social and vocational societies in the Soviet Union and Iraq was pointed out, in order to strengthen the amiable relations between the Soviet and Iraqi peoples.

PRAVDA CARRIES ANNIVERSARY MESSAGE TO ANGOLA

PM111419 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Nov 86 First Edition p 1

[USSR leadership bodies' message to Angolan president on independence anniversary]

[Text] To Comrade Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-labor Party [MPLA-PT] and president of the People's Republic of Angola

We warmly congratulate you, the MPLA-PT Central Committee, the Standing Commission of the National People's Assembly, the Angolan Government, and the entire Angolan people on the occasion of National Day -- the 11th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of the People's Republic of Angola.

Having won the struggle for independence, the Angolan patriots, led by their vanguard, the MPLA-PT, made a sovereign choice and proclaimed the building of a new society in keeping with the aspirations of the entire people as their aim.

In our time the ability to live and work in an atmosphere of lasting peace is an indispensable precondition for the successful implementation by peoples of their creative plans for socioeconomic development and increasing prosperity. However, imperialist circles are still yearning for their former supremacy and are still trying to implement their hegemonist schemes. This is why the Soviet Union, the other socialist states, and all people who treasure progress and the peoples' well-being now see no more important task than preserving peace and creating to this end a universal system of international security meeting the interests of all states, large and small, without exception.

We highly value Angola's active struggle for peace and against the aggressive imperialist policy, colonialism, and racism. The Angolan people know well what war is like. Even today, 11 years after achieving independence, they have to defend with weapon in hand their sacred right to development along their chosen path.

Soviet people express their solidarity with the courageous Angolan people, who are defending their revolutionary gains against the encroachments of external and internal enemies in the shape of the military of the racist Republic of South Africa and its hirelings. Loyal to its policy of friendship with Angola, the Soviet Union will continue to do all in its power to ensure that Soviet-Angolan relations, which have a reliable basis in the Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation between our countries, strengthen with every passing day.

We wish the Angolan working people and their leadership much success in peaceful building, the strengthening of the country's defense capability, and the achievement of the aims set by the Second MPLA-PT Congress.

CPSU Central Committee

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium
USSR Council of Ministers

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON SUPREME SOVIET SESSION

IZVESTIYA on 17 Nov Session

PM181418 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Nov 86 Morning Edition pp 1, 5

[Unattributed "Information Report on the Sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet"]

[Text] The 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th convocation, began in Moscow on 17 November 1986.

The first joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities took place in the Great Kremlin Palace at 1000 hours. A.E. Voss, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, was in the chair.

Following a proposal of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, approved by the chambers' Councils of Elders, the USSR Supreme Soviet approved the agenda and order to work for the session.

The following questions were included on the agenda:

1. The State Plant for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1987 and progress in fulfilling the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986.

2. The USSR State Budget for 1987 and the fulfillment of the USSR State Budget in 1985.

3. The activity of the USSR People's Control Committee.

4. The draft USSR Law on Individual Labor Activity.

5. The ratification of USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decrees.

The USSR Supreme Soviet heard a report from Deputy N.V. Talyzin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gosplan, on the State Plan for the Economic and Social Develpment of the USSR for 1987 and progress in fulfilling the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986, and a report from Deputy B.I. Gostev, USSR minister of finance, on the USSR State Budget for 1987 and the fulfillment of the USSR State Budget in 1985.

Deputy G.I. Marchuk, president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and Deputy S.A. Shalayev, chairman of the AUCCTU, then spoke.

The first session of the Soviet of the Union took place at 1400 hours in the hall of sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers. L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union, was in the chair.

The deputies and guests rose to honor the memory of the late Deputy A.G. Petrishchev.

The Soviet of the Union heard a report from K.S. Demirchyan, chairman of the Credentials Commission, on the checking of the credentials of deputies elected since the USSR Supreme Soviet's fifth session to replace departed deputies. The Soviet of the Union resolved to recognize the credentials of the following deputies: V.A. Kuptsov, elected for Velikoustyugskiy Electoral Okrug No. 140 in Vologda Oblast; V.V. Bakatin, elected for Sovetskiy Electoral Okrug No. 196 in Kirov Oblast; Ye. S. Storoyev, elected for Livenskiy Electoral Okrug No. 248 in Orel Oblast; Yu. I. Litvintsev, elected for Shchekinskiy Electoral Okrug No. 319 in Tula Oblast; V.I. Mironenko, elected for Lozovskiy Electoral Okrug No. 529 in Kharkov Oblast, Ukrainian SSR; M.M. Aripdzhanov, elected for Izbaskanskiy Electoral Okrug No. 579 in Andizhan Oblast, Uzbek SSR; V.V. Dementsev, elected for Karshinskiy Electoral Okrug No. 586 in Kashka-Darya Oblast, Uzbek SSR; A.S. Yefimov, elected for Navoiyskiy Electoral Okrug No. 588 in Navoi Oblast, Uzbek SSR; G.A. Yagodin, elected for Bukinskiy Electoral Okrug No. 605 in Tashkent Oblast, Uzbek SSR; Yu.N. Trofimov, elected for Aktyubinskiy Rural Electoral Okrug No. 623 in Aktyubinsk Oblast, Kazakh SSR; A.A. Kulibayev, elected for Guryevskiy Electoral Okrug No. 627 in Guryev Oblast, Kazakh SSR; L.B. Vasilyev, elected for Samtredskiy Electoral Okrug No. 670 in the Georgian SSR; V.A. Bykov, elected for Kanibadamskiy Electoral Okrug No. 726 in the Tajik SSR; Yu.A. Belyakov, elected for Vologogradskiy Electoral Okrug No. 5 in Moscow City; L.V. Sharin, elected for Belogorskiy Electoral Okrug No. 108 in Amur Oblast; F.A. Tabeyev, elected for Rzhevskiy Electoral Okrug No. 178 in Kalinin Oblast; N.S. Yermakov, elected for Ordzhonikidzevskiy Electoral Okrug No. 188 in Kemerovo Oblast; A.N. Plekhanov, elected for Lebyazhyevskiy Electoral Okrug No. 210 in Kurgan Oblast; P.A. Smolskiy, elected for Sasovskiy Electoral Okrug No. 281 in Ryazan Oblast; Yu.V. Petrov, elected for Kushvinskiy Electoral Okrug No. 301 in Sverdlovsk Oblast; A.S. Systsov, elected for Leninskiy Electoral Okrug No. 382 in the Tatar ASSR; A.P. Sazonov, elected for Vasilyevskiy Electoral Okrug No. 460 in Zaporozhye Oblast, Ukrainian SSR; G.I. Revenko, elected for Belotserkovskiy Electoral Okrug No. 472 in Kiev Oblast, Ukrainian SSR; V.G. Anufriyev, elected for Taldy-Kurganskiy Rural Electoral Okrug No. 648 in Taldy-Kurgan Oblast, Kazakh SSR; Yu.A. Sklyarov, elected for Rybnitskiy Electoral Okrug No. 703 in the Moldavian SSR; and Yu.P. Kochetkov, elected for Sevanskiy Electoral Okrug No. 738 in the Armenian SSR.

In connection with his appointment as deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Deputy V.K. Gusev was released from his duties as chairman of the Consumer Goods and Services to the Population Commission.

The Soviet of the Union elected Deputy F.A. Tabeyev chairman of that commission.

Other changes were also made to the composition of standing commissions of the chamber.

The subsidiary report of the Plan and Budget and other standing commissions on the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1987 and progress in fulfilling the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR in 1986, on the USSR State Budget for 1987, and on the fulfillment of the USSR State Budget in 1985 was then delivered by V.A. Masol, chairman of the Plan and Budget Commission.

The following deputies spoke in the debates on these questions: F.A. Tabeyev, A.P. Lyashko, K.M. Bagirov, L.P. Shurybina, V.G. Klyuyev, and T.A. Alimov.

The session is continuing.

Soviet of Union Session

LD181358 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1315 GMT 18 Nov 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] Hello comrades! In a previous news bulletin we already said that the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet continued its work in the Kremlin today at separate sessions of the chambers, and that at 1000, the second session of the Soviet of Nationalities opened.

Now another report has come from the Kremlin: The second session of the Soviet of the Union began today at 1500. The deputies and guests greeted with applause Comrade Gorbachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Kunayev, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Dolgikh, Slyunkov, Solovyev, Talyzin, Medvedev, and Razumovskiy.

Deputies Discuss Socioeconomics

LD181628 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Two hours ago in the Kremlin the second session of the Soviet of the Union — one of the chambers of the highest organ of state power in the country — opened. The deputies and visitors applauded Comrades Gorbachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Kunayev, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Dolgikh, Slyunkov, Solovyev, Talyzin, Medvedev, and Razumovskiy.

Now the deputies are continuing their discussion of the draft plans for the socioeconomic development of the country and its budget for 1987. They stress that the coming year will be of great significance in the development of the national economy, since it will be precisely in the second year of the 5-year plan that the new methods of socialist management will become widely employed. This has been fully reflected in the draft program for the socioeconomic development of the USSR.

The participants in the debate in the Soviet of the Union — and they included Comrade Alimov, first secretary of the Tashkent Oblast Committee of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan; (Kuleshov), general director of the Minsk Tractor Works Association; (Klepikov), a brigade leader from the Krasnodar Kuban collective farms; and others — introduced proposals to approve the draft plan and the budget of the country for 1987. Similar proposals were introduced today during debates in the other chamber of the Supreme Soviet — the Soviet of Nationalities.

Budget Debate Continues

LD181626 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS — The deputies of the USSR Supreme Soviet (Parliament) today continued the debate on the drafts of the state plan of the economic and social development and the budget of the USSR for 1987 in separate sessions of the chambers.

The deputies pointed out that the tentative results of the current year show that the national economy was developing at higher rates than those recorded last year. The plan for the next year also projects high targets.

For instance, the national income will go up by over four per cent. The deputies suggested approving the drafts of the country's plan and budget.

The session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work on Wednesday.

Budget Debate Ends

LD181316 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpt] At the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Our correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy presents a report from the Kremlin:

[Ruvinskiy] The debate on next year's plan and budget ended half an hour ago in one of the chambers -- the Soviet of Nationalities. In that debate 22 deputies participated, representing all the union republics and a number of autonomous republics. When the Supreme Soviet conducts its work in separate chambers in this way, this gives the opportunity for taking into account the interests of and raising problems of each union republic separately, as well as those touching on sectors of the economy or education, culture or health care affecting the country as a whole.

So what, for instance, are characteristic features for Belorussia? Here it is planned to increase machine-tool and instrument building; there is to be an increase in output of machine tools with numerical program control. In Moldavia there is to be an increase in the capacity of the agro-industrial complex, including in the output of juices and fruit or vegetable conserves. Among the most important tasks for Kazakhstan, as before, are those of increasing grain production and developing sheep farming. For the republics of Central Asia and the Transcaucasus, the plan looks to the work-capable population being drawn more fully into public sector production.

And so the deputies have primarily discussed how to tackle all these matters. A characteristic feature has been the fact that every intervention has included pointed and principled reference to the importance of the quality of work and output.

There is now an interval in the work of the session, and preparations are under way for a sitting of the Soviet of the Union.

Results To Be Summarized

LD181940 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpts] The deputies of both chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet session continued their discussion of the draft plan for the country's socioeconomic development and its budget for 1987. They stressed that to improve the operation at all levels of the national economy and strengthen the role of labor collectives restructuring must be carried out more decisively. [passage omitted] Many of the deputies commented that a thoughtful attitude to the technical level and quality of output is now demanded of every worker. [passage omitted] In analyzing the country's plan and budget for next year, the participants at the session pointed out their social orientation. [passage omitted]

The debates on the draft plan for the country's socioeconomic development and its draft budget for 1987 were completed at today's session. The results of the debates will be summed up tomorrow at a joint session of both chambers. In addition, the deputies are to examine questions relating to the activities of the USSR People's Control Committee; to the USSR bill on individual labor activity; and to ratification of decrees of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Session Hears Criticism

LD181634 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Excerpts] The USSR Supreme Soviet is continuing a session in Moscow. [passage omitted] The deputies have been speaking favorably about the planned high rates of the nation's development and the program's emphasis on social progress. There's been strong criticism however of low quality still existing in production, of bureaucracy and mismanagement which are yet to be uprooted and substandard technical equipment of some enterprises. The minister of the woodworking industry, Mikhail Busygin, admitted that many makes of furniture and country cottages were finding no demand on the market. His industry is now restructuring its work so that all of its produce would be up to the best world standards.

The Education Ministry and the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences came in for criticism from Venera Mamedova, a teacher in Azerbaijan. She blamed the agencies for the shortage of new textbooks and teachers of a new subject, the rudiments of computer science. Many of the deputies have contributed proposals aimed at improving education, health care and retail trade.

TASS Reports Culture Speeches

LD181327 Moscow TASS in English 1244 GMT 18 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 18 TASS -- A TASS correspondent reports from the Kremlin:

Deputies at the current session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR speak not only of projects for the economic and social development of their country but also changes in the culture field.

Deputy Vladimir Karpov, first secretary of the Board of the Writers' Union, said specifically: The writers' organisation orients its members towards reflecting new tendencies in the life of Soviet society, specifically, in its cultural life.

After the 27th Congress of the CPSU we talk and write much about our shortcomings. Reading about such things often makes one bitter and sad, but we must tell the truth, Karpov went on. It has a cleansing effect, frees the writer of his old feeling of being restricted by some "rules" which forbid him to touch certain themes. There are no such things today.

But to write of shortcomings only is incomplete truth. The full truth today is that shortcomings should be given a principled assessment and that struggle is going on to overcome stagnation both in the economic and cultural fields. That is what we must write about today if we are to reflect the truth of life.

This writer was not the only one who spoke of changes in the cultural field at the current Supreme Soviet session. Mirab Berdzenishvili, sculptor from Georgia, spoke at the session of the need to produce more talented monuments glorifying the working man. The language of sculpture, he said, lives through the centuries. It is thanks to the art of sculpture that we know today what prehistoric Egyptians and ancient Greeks looked like.

I was gladdened as an artist by the fact that the draft plan for the next year reflects increased attention to the improvement of the cultural life of Soviet society.

Changes in the minds of people should be started when they are still in school, said Deputy Venera Mamedova, country school teacher from Azerbaijan (Transcaucasia). We are trying to bring it home to our pupils that great positive changes are now taking place in our life and that these changes stimulate initiative and creativity. This is an important part of our work under the school reform which is being carried out in the USSR.

TV Lists Speakers

LD181845 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Good evening, comrades! Today in Moscow, the sixth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation is continuing its work at separate sittings of the chambers. At 1000 the second sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities opened in the session hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet. [video shows several brief panshots of the audience, then dwells on the center of the presidium, where sitting in the upper row are Sokolov and Nikonov, in the second row left to right are Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Biryukova, and Dobrynin, in the lower row are three unidentified deputies. Further clips of the audience reveal Marshals of the Soviet Union Kulikov and Ogarkov]

Taking part in the meeting are Comrades Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Sokolov, Biryukova, Dobrynin, and Nikonov. Speaking in the debates on the country's plan and budget for the next year were: Deputy Nazirov, operator of the Fergananefteorgsintex Production Association; Deputy Tatarchuk, first secretary of the Kalinin obkom; Deputy Berdzenishvili, sculptor from Georgia; Deputy Mamedova, a teacher of the Sadarak village secondary school in the Azerbaijan SSR; Deputy Busygin, USSR minister of timber, pulp and paper and wood processing industry; Deputy Kiselev, second secretary of the Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee; Deputy Bolshakov, general director of the Moldavian Tochlibmash Production Association; Deputy Ipyatis, computer maintenance engineer of the Ventspils staging oil base of the Latvian SSR; Deputy Ambartsumyan, rector of Yerevan state university; Deputy Galiyev, chairman of the (Unysh) kolkhoz of the Bashkirian ASSR: Deputy Mitrin, first secretary of the Krasnovodsk obkom of Turkmen Communist Party; Deputy Rakhmonov, assembly workers' team leader of the 33d construction directorate of the Tadzhikkhimstroy Trust; Deputy Ovsyannikova, deputy chief doctor of a rayon hospital in the Khanty-Mansi autonomous okrug; Deputy Pedok, chairman of the Estonian republican trade union congress; Deputy Lyabushev, chief agricultural engineer of the Red Banner kolkhoz of the Mordovian ASSR. [video shows all listed speakers]

The sitting of the Soviet of Nationalities has ended.

Leadership Evening Session

LD182259 Moscow Televsion Service in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Nov 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report]

[Text] This evening the second session of the Soviet of the Union opened in the session hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers.

The deputies and guests met with applause Comrades Gorbachev, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Kunayev, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Dolgikh, Slyunkov, Solovyev, Talyzin, Medvedev and Razumovskiy. [video shows presidium taking seats -- back row: Solovyev, Slyunkov, Medvedev; third row: Razumovskiy, Vorotnikov, Zaykov, Solomentsev, Shcherbitskiy, Kunayev, Talyzin, Dolgikh; second row: Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Gromyko, Gorbachev, Aliyev, Demichev; front row: Grishyavichus, Kulova, Tolkunov, (?Narmatova), Paton]

The following spoke in the discussion of matters relating to the state plan and country's budget for 1986: Deputy Kuleshov, general director of the Minsk Lenin Tractor Works Production Association; Deputy Klepikov, team leader of composite team of the Kuban kolkhoz, Krasnodar Kray; Deputy Kulibayev, first secretary of Guryev Obkom of the Communist Party of Kazakhstan; deputy Cherkeziya, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Georgian SSR; Deputy Aksamitauskene, weaver at the Kaunus Drobe Production Association; deputy Makhkamov, first secretary of the communist party of Tajikistan Central Committee; Deputy Mokanu, chairman of the Supreme Soviet Presidium of the Moldavian SSR; Deputy Sabirov, fitter and assembly team leader of the Naryngidroenergostroy Construction Administration, Kirgiz SSR; Deputy Popov, first secretary of Altay Kraykom; deputy Liyeberg, chairman of the 9 May kolkhoz, Estonian SSR; Deputy Logachev, chairman of the presidium of the Eastern Siberian branch of the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department; Deputy Markaryan, plastering team leader of the Yerpromstroy Trust Building Administration of the Armenian SSR; Deputy Nurgilbiyev, metal worker at the Lenin Locomotive Depot at Ashkhabad Station, Turkmen SSR; Deputy Trofimova, crane operator at the Maritime Kray Primorremrybflot Production and Ship Repair Association; Deputy Pogodin, chairman of the Executive committee of the Kuybyshev Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies; and Deputy Lebedeva, head of department at the Ordzhonikidze Sanatorium, Kislovodsk, Stavropol Kray.

On 19 November the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet will continue its work. [video shows each speaker at rostrum, brief cuts to audience and panorama shots of platform]

Third Day Agenda

LD190427 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0100 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Text] The 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation will resume its work today in the great Kremlin palace. Those taking part in the session are to sum up the results of the discussion of the drafts of the plan for the country's social and economic development, and its budget, for 1987. Also, according to the agenda, they will have to examine another three questions: the activity of the People's Control Committee, the draft law on individual labor activity, and confirmation of decrees of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Soviets Hold Joint Session

LD190622 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0304 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Excerpts] Today is the third day of the work of the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. A joint session of the Soviet of the Union and of the Soviet Nationalities will open at 1000 in the morning in the meeting hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Great Kremlin Palace. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev, Sokolov Attend

LD190916 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0800 GMT 19 Nov 86

[From the "Novosti" newscast]

[Text] The 6th session of the USSR Supreme Soviet of the 11th convocation continued its work in Moscow today in the Great Kremlin Palace, at a joint session of the chambers. Delegates and guests greeted with applause Comrades Gorbachev, Aliyev, Virotnikov, Gromyko, Zaykov, Kunayev, Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Solomentsev, Chebrikov, Shevardnadze, Shcherbitskiy, Demichev, Dolgikh, Yeltsin, Sylunkov, Sokolov, Solovyev, Talyzin, Biryukova, Dobrynin, Medvedev, Nikonov, Razumovskiy, and Kapitonov. The session was chaired by deputy Tolkunov, chairman of the Soviet of the Union.

The final speech on the state plan for the country's economic and social development for 1987 and on the implementation of the 1986 plan was delivered by Deputy Talyzin first deputy chairman of USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR Gosplan.

In separate voting by chamber, the deputies unanimously adopted the law on the state plan for the country's development for next year, and a resolution on how fulfillment of the plan is proceeding in the current year. The final speech on the country's state budget for 1987 and on implementation of the budget for 1985 was delivered by Comrade Gostev, USSR minister of finance.

The session continues its work. [video shows long shot of platform, deputies standing and applauding. Gorbachev enters along back of platform and stands at his seat, center left in second row back, applauding. Various shots of left side of platform shown on screen from left to right, front row: Lobacheva, Toliunov, Voss; second row: Ligachev, Ryzhkov, Gromyko, Gorbachev; third row: Chebrikov, Aliyev, Vorotnikov, Zaykov and Solomentsev; fourth row: Talyzin, Demichev, Dolgikh. Taylyzin shown speaking at rostrum with Atanov visible over his shoulder on right of platform, apparently asleep. Gostev shown speaking at rostrum.]

Budget, Plan Approved

LD190743 Moscow TASS in English 0741 GMT 19 Nov 86

[Text] Moscow November 19 (TASS) -- Today the USSR Supreme Soviet endorsed the country's socio-economic development plan and budget for 1987.

National income is to grow by 4.1 per cent. This will exceed the planned target for 1986.

Three quarters of national income increment will used to raise the living standard of the people.

The population's real incomes will grow by more than 2.5 per cent within the year.

The USSR's budget for next year is also notable for greater social directedness. For example, appropriations for social and cultural activities will amount to 140,000 million roubles. That will be approximately a third of the budget.

The share of defence expenditures in the budget of the USSR is kept at this year's level -- 4.6 per cent.

ECONOMIC MANAGEMENT COMMISSION HOLDS SESSION

PM281623 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No. 43, Oct 86 (Signed to Press 16 Oct 86) p 7

[Unattributed report: "In the Commission for the Improvement of Management, Planning, and the Economic Mechanism"]

[Text] At its regular sessions, the Commission for the Improvement of Management, Planning, and the Economic Machinery, which was set up by a USSR Council of Ministers decree, examined questions of transferring enterprises belonging to several ministries, including railroads under the Ministry of Railways, machine bulding production associations (enterprises) under the Ministry of the Coal Industry, construction industry production associations (enterprises) under the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, scientific institutions and organizations, and science-and-production associations to new conditions of economic management, and also questions of transferring scientific research and technology organizations belonging to science-and-production and production associations to complete financial autonomy and self-financing.

The transfer of associations (enterprises) and organizations belonging to the Belorussian SSR Ministry of Consumer Services to self-financing and distribution of earnings according to the residual gross income method was examined and basically approved, as was the transfer of the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet and its constituent shipping lines and enterprises engaged in basic operational activity to complete financial autonomy.

The results of the experiment conducted in the Belorussian SSR to reduce the resource-intensiveness of construction work were discussed. It was noted that the experiment confirmed the great economic benefit of its conditions and stipulations, which ensure the reduction of the resource-intensiveness of construction work through accelerating the pace of the introduction of scientific and technical progress and advanced experience. Stabilization of the estimated costs of construction and installation work has been achieved there in parallel with reductions in labor and material expenditure. Additions and amendments to the methodological principles for conducting this experiment were made on the basis of a generalization of accumulated experience.

It was decided to extend the conditions of the experiment conducted in the Belorussian SSR to reduce the resource-intensiveness of construction work to the Moscow Gorispolkom's Moscow City Main Administration for the Construction of Engineering Installations.

Questions concerning the enhanced responsibility of economic leadership organs and of supply and sales, transportation, and other organizations for ensuring steady and stable work by all components of the national economy were examined, as were measures to liquidate loss-making in the national economy.

The results of selective inspection of the practical introduction of individual provisions of the new economic machinery were discussed.

A report was heard from the USSR Ministry of Light Industry regarding the preparation of enterprises for transfer to new conditions of economic management. The ministry's attention was drawn to the inadequate monitoring of the notification of methodological principles and normatives to enterprises and the lack of fundamental restructuring in the work of the ministry's central apparatus.

It was noted that the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee and the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry are unjustifiably delaying the coordination with the USSR Ministry of Light Industry of methodological principles for the organization and holding of trade fairs for the sale of basic raw and other materials and of regulations for material and technical supplies of raw and other materials to USSR Ministry of Light Industry enterprises.

The question of completing the transfer of USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy enterprises to new conditions of economic management as of 1 January 1987 was examined.

VORONIN ADDRESSES ECONOMIC SEMINAR FOR MINISTERS

PM140921 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Nov 86 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Economic Cadres' Studies"]

[Text] A seminar for ministers and deputy ministers of union and union republic ministries and departments switching to the new management methods in 1987 has been held at the USSR Council of Ministers academy of the National Economy Institute for Raising the Qualifications of Leaders in the Top Link of State Management.

Questions of restructuring the system of economic management in the light of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions, accelerating scientific and technical progress, improving the system of plan indicators and normatives, material and technical supplies, price formation, the organization of labor remuneration, and the management of capital construction, increasing the impact of the financial and credit mechanism on production efficiency, and switching to economic methods of leadership at all levels of the national economy were examined during the studies.

Great attention was devoted to the preparations for switching associations and enterprises to full financial autonomy and self-financing.

There was an exchange of experience on the preparations for switching to the new management methods, taking account of the practice of sectors, enterprises, and associations that were switched earlier to the new conditions of planning and economic incentives for labor collectives.

The seminar was addressed by V.P. Mozhin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Economic Section; L.A. Voronin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR Gossnab; S.A. Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan; V.S. Pavlov, chairman of the USSR State Prices Committee; M.S. Zotov, chairman of the board of the USSR Bank for Financing Capital Investments; L.A. Bibin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosstroy; A.I. Milyukov, deputy chief of a section of the USSR Council of Ministers Administration of Affairs; L.A. Kostin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems; V.A. Salnikov, USSR deputy minister of finance; V.A. Pushnyan, deputy minister of instrument making, automation equipment, and control systems; and general directors of associations and enteprises.

NIKONOV, OTHERS MARK AGRICULTURAL WORKERS DAY

LD150446 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0204 GMT 15 Nov 86

[Text] A festive meeting devoted to the day of workers of agriculture and the processing industry of the agro-industrial complex took place on 14 November in Moscow in the state central concert hall. On the presidium were Comrade Nikonov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; ministers of the USSR and of the RSFSR; chairmen of state committees; senior staff of the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Council of Ministers, ministries and departments; winners of socialist competition and production innovators; and scientists. A report was delivered by Comrade Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the country's State-Agro-Industrial Committee.

MINISTER PROMISES IMPROVED BREAD PRODUCTS

PM181301 [Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 November 1986 First Edition carries on page 4 under the headline "Thoughts About Bread" a 1,800-word TASS correspondent interview with G.S. Zolotukhin, USSR minister of bread products, commenting on readers' letters asking about planned developments in the bread-baking industry.

The minister is quoted as saying: "As of 1987, it is proposed to increase production of bread made from top-quality wheat flour and rye flour. USSR Bread Products Ministry enterprises will increase production of bread made from top-quality wheat flour 120 percent by 1990, and its production will already total at least 900,000 metric tons in 1987." And he continues: "During the current 5-year plan it is planned to construct, enlarge, or modernize 240 bread-baking enterprises in various parts of the country and to renew more than one-third of milling enterprise capacities. In the country as a whole it is proposed to more than double production of top-quality flour over the next few years."

Going on to speak about bread prices, the minister emphasizes that "the prices of existing types of bread will stay at the present level." However, he points out that "the bread-baking industry will start up production of new kinds of bread -- of higher quality, more tasty and aromatic, that do not go stale so quickly. For this the necessary additives will be needed, and some types of flour will need to be replaced by higher-quality flour." All this will cost money, reportedly more than R200 million, which will be reflected in the price of the new kinds of bread. However, the minister maintains that the additional cost to the consumer, given the same level of bread consumption, will be only of the order of 1 kopek a day.

SYR-DARYA OBLAST EXCEEDS AGRICULTURAL TARGETS

PM121129 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 11 Nov 86 p 1

[Unnamed SELSKAYA ZHIZN correspondent report under the general heading: "The Motto Is Acceleration"]

[Text] Gulistan, 10 Nov -- The virgin land grain harvest has increased this year in Syr-Darya Oblast. For the first time crop farmers there have delivered 62,000 metric tons of grain to the state granaries and overfulfilled the plan. They also coped ahead of schedule with the yearly target for the sale of vegetables and potatoes. Some 63,000 metric tons of vegetables and 3,100 metric tons of potatoes have been dispatched to the procurement centers.